

JPRS-TAC-86-044

5 JUNE 1986

Worldwide Report

ARMS CONTROL

FBIS FOREIGN BROADCAST INFORMATION SERVICE

NOTE

JPRS publications contain information primarily from foreign newspapers, periodicals and books, but also from news agency transmissions and broadcasts. Materials from foreign-language sources are translated; those from English-language sources are transcribed or reprinted, with the original phrasing and other characteristics retained.

Headlines, editorial reports, and material enclosed in brackets [] are supplied by JPRS. Processing indicators such as [Text] or [Excerpt] in the first line of each item, or following the last line of a brief, indicate how the original information was processed. Where no processing indicator is given, the information was summarized or extracted.

Unfamiliar names rendered phonetically or transliterated are enclosed in parentheses. Words or names preceded by a question mark and enclosed in parentheses were not clear in the original but have been supplied as appropriate in context. Other unattributed parenthetical notes within the body of an item originate with the source. Times within items are as given by source.

The contents of this publication in no way represent the policies, views or attitudes of the U.S. Government.

PROCUREMENT OF PUBLICATIONS

JPRS publications may be ordered from the National Technical Information Service, Springfield, Virginia 22161. In ordering, it is recommended that the JPRS number, title, date and author, if applicable, of publication be cited.

Current JPRS publications are announced in Government Reports Announcements issued semi-monthly by the National Technical Information Service, and are listed in the Monthly Catalog of U.S. Government Publications issued by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402.

Correspondence pertaining to matters other than procurement may be addressed to Joint Publications Research Service, 1000 North Glebe Road, Arlington, Virginia 22201.

5 JUNE 1986

WORLDWIDE REPORT

ARMS CONTROL

CONTENTS

U.S.-USSR GENEVA TALKS

Soviet Chief of Staff on U.S. 'Sinister Plans', 'Neoglobalism' (S. F. Akhromeyev; Moscow IZVESTIYA, 9 May 86)	1
Karpov Comments on Prospects for Current Round (Moscow PRAVDA, 7, 9 May 86; East Berlin Television Service, 8 May 86)	5
Arrival Statement	5
GDR TV Interview, Viktor Karpov Interview 'Ball in U.S. Court'	7
Soviet Commentaries on May Reopening of Talks (Various sources, 8, 10 May 86)	8
U.S. 'Evaded Serious Discussion', by Vladimir Dmitriyev	8
U.S., Soviet Statements Contrasted	8
Soviet Proposals Summarized	9
U.S. Doing 'Nothing', by Georgiy Zubkov	11
Reagan Statement Hit, by Vitaliy Gan	11
TASS Reports Space Arms Meetings Held 13-20 May (Moscow TASS, various dates)	13
Space Arms Group 13 May	13
Strategic Arms Group 14 May	13
Plenary, INF Sessions 15 May	13
Space Arms Group 20 May	13

Soviet Foreign Ministry Press Conference on Geneva Talks (Moscow Domestic Service, 16 May 86; Moscow TASS, 16 May 86)	14
Radio Broadcast, by Viktor Levin, et al.	14
U.S. Planning To Violate SALT II	17
Soviet Stand on Talks	18
Lomeyko on Chernobyl, Western 'Psychosis'	19
USSR's Arbatov Assails U.S. Attitude (Georgiy Arbatov Interview; Warsaw Television Service, 8 May 86)	21
Moscow Talk Show Ponders Chernobyl's Effect on U.S. Stance (Boris Andrianov, et al.; Moscow Domestic Service, 18 May 86)	24
CHEMICAL/BIOLOGICAL WEAPONS	
Belgian Prime Minister on Modernization of U.S. Chemical Weapons (Paris AFP, 16 May 86)	29
RELATED ISSUES	
Soviet Army Paper Hits West on Nuclear Testing, INF, SDI (V. Dodonov; Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA, 17 May 86)	30
PRAVDA Article on Arms Verification Issue (Yu. Tomilin; Moscow PRAVDA, 13 May 86)	33
Soviet Journal on Arms Policy in New Party Program (A. Osipov; Moscow MIROVAYA EKONOMIKA I MEZHDUNARODNYE OTNOSHENIYA, No 2, Feb 86)	37
USSR: Importance, Nature of Strategic Parity (O. Bykov; Moscow MIROVAYA EKONOMIKA I MEZHDUNARODNYE OTNOSHENIYA, No 3, Mar 86)	43
Soviet Talk Show on Lessons of Chernobyl, Western Reaction (Valentin Zorin, et al.; Moscow Television Service, 17 May 86)	57
Moscow Daily Denounces Adelman's Remarks on Chernobyl (Mikhail Ozerov; Moscow SOVetskaya Rossiya, 18 May 86) ...	62
Gromyko Receives Italian Christian Association President (Moscow TASS, 19 May 86)	64
TASS: FRG's Rau Supports Soviet Proposals (Moscow TASS, 14 May 86)	66

PRAVDA Reporter Assails Kohl Remarks on Arms Issues (Moscow TASS, 19 May 86)	67
USSR: Romania's Ceausescu Discusses Arms Issues With Gorbachev (Moscow PRAVDA, 17 May 86)	69
TASS Cites GDR's Honecker on Test Ban, Chemical Weapons (Moscow TASS, 16 May 86)	71
PRAVDA Review of Week's International Events (Nikolay Prozhogin; Moscow PRAVDA, 4 May 86)	72
Briefs TASS Cites PRC Foreign Minister	74

U.S.-USSR GENEVA TALKS

SOVIET CHIEF OF STAFF ON U.S. 'SINISTER PLANS', 'NEOGLOBALISM'

PM121210 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 9 May 86 Morning Edition p 3

[Article by Marshal of the Soviet Union S.F. Akhromeyev, chief of the Armed Forces General Staff and USSR first deputy defense minister: "The Lessons of History"]

[Excerpt] The victory over Hitlerite Germany and its satellites were gained through the joint efforts of the people of many countries. Soviet people will always remember and hold in high esteem the selfless struggle against the fascist invaders waged by military units and partisan armies and detachments in Yugoslavia, Poland, Czechoslovakia, Bulgaria, and Romania, the patriots in Hungary and Albania, and those who took part in the Resistance Movement and the antifascist underground. A major contribution to the victory in World War II was made by the people and Armies of the United States, Great Britain, France, China, and other states of the anti-Hitler coalition. This is the reason why the victory in the war against the forces of fascism, militarism, and reaction is correctly regarded throughout the world as a historic achievement of all the people of the anti-Hitler coalition. World War II confirmed beyond any doubt the correctness of Lenin's conclusion that as long as imperialism exists, the danger that it will unleash wars prevails. The policy implemented by imperialism today is profoundly hostile to the interests of the world's people.

Today too, imperialism is trying by every means available, including war, to check the course of history, to undermine socialism's positions, and to take social revenge on a worldwide scale. "Imperialism is to blame for two world wars which claimed many tens of millions of lives," the new edition of the CPSU Program says. "It has created the threat of a third world war. Imperialism is placing the achievements of human genius at the service of the development of weapons whose destructive force is horrendous. The policy of the imperialist circles which are prepared to sacrifice the future of entire peoples is enhancing the danger that these weapons may be used." Never before has the danger of nuclear war loom so large as it does today. U.S. reactionary circles are the initiators of the arms race, they try to check progress and suppress freedom. Cynically using "peace-loving" rhetoric as a cover, they undermine the "spirit of Geneva" and are working toward destroying the strategic equilibrium between the USSR and the United States, between the Warsaw Pact and NATO, and are seeking military superiority. To this end, the United States annually spends hundreds of billions of dollars for a multitude of military programs; year after year it is

building up its strategic offensive potential; it is creating [sozdayet] space-strike means; it is improving conventional arms; it is developing [razrabatyvayet] weapons based on new physical principles that resemble nuclear weapons in terms of their destructive capacity. Sinister plans for a new world war are being hatched in the United States.

Having turned the cult of strength into a state policy, Washington is implementing the aggressive doctrine of "neoglobalism." It has been used to kindle the war in Angola and to organize, fund, and inspire the aggression against Nicaragua. Another manifestation of it was the U.S. armed attack against sovereign Libya. "Even the few people in the West," the Soviet Government statement of 15 April 1986 emphasizes, "who still had some illusions on account of the real aspirations of the White House have been able to see and judge for themselves by the latest U.S. actions, that its current policy is a policy of aggression, a policy of provoking regional conflicts, a policy of perpetuating confrontation and teetering on the brink of war." In the present situation, the experience of cooperation accumulated during World War II in the struggle of the anti-Hitler coalition of states with different social systems against aggression assumes special topicality. It is an incontrovertible historical fact that more than 50 countries of the anti-Hitler coalition were able during the war, rising above sociopolitical differences and disagreements, to pool their efforts in the struggle against fascism. This is the most convincing proof of the viability of the principle of peaceful coexistence elaborated by the founder of the Soviet state, V.I. Lenin. "The course of history and of social progress," M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee emphasized in the Political Report to the 27th CPSU Congress, "demands ever more insistently the establishment of constructive, creative collaboration between states and people on a worldwide scale... This collaboration is necessary in order to avert a nuclear catastrophe and ensure mankind's survival. It is also necessary in order to resolve, jointly and in the interests of one another other problems which concern humanity as whole which are growing more acute. The real dialectic of the present-day development lies in the combination of the competition and rivalry between the two systems and the growing trend toward the interdependence of the states of the world community."

The main lesson of World War II, namely that war must be combated before it has begun therefore assumes special topicality today. Historical experience indicates that joint, concerted, and vigorous action on the part of all peace-loving forces against the aggressive actions of imperialism is necessary in order to defend peace.

Even today the policy of certain NATO bloc states is reminiscent of the actions of the governments of Great Britain and France at that time. Even now Great Britain and the FRG are helping the United States escalate the arms race. They are transforming their countries' territories into a U.S. nuclear missile bridgehead, they are getting involved in the implementation of the "star wars" program, and are helping to kindle conflicts in various parts of the world.

As opposed to imperialism, socialism categorically rejects war as a means of resolving political and economic contradictions and ideological disputes between states. "Our ideal," the CPSU Central Committee Political Report to the 27th party congress notes, "is a world without weapons or violence... Consequently, the struggle against the nuclear danger, against the arms race, for a reduction [as published] and strengthening of world peace will continue to be the main sphere of the party's activity in the world arena." At present, in the nuclear and space age, when an enormous nuclear potential has been created on earth capable of destroying civilization several times over, our

party's conclusion that it is no longer possible to think in terms of old concepts and categories assumes cardinal importance. In our time, a fundamentally new approach to the problem of the security of people and states is necessary. The nuclear epoch has radically changed the content of the policy of peaceful coexistence. There can be no victors in a nuclear war, the succession of periods of peacetime and wartime has come to an end, the cycle "war, peaceful interlude, followed by another war" ended with the nuclear bombing of Hiroshima and Nagasaki.

In the nuclear age, security has become the main political task. And it must be resolved by political means, by achieving relaxation of tension, by arms limitation and reduction, and strengthening of trust and international cooperation and not by means of arms or doctrines of "containment" or "deterrence." It is irresponsible today to seek security through the arms race, through improving the "shield" and the "sword." It is impossible today to create two kinds of security, one more reliable for oneself, and another for one's neighbor. Thus, for instance, the United States and NATO in siting U.S. medium-range missiles in Europe are bringing the threat closer not just to the Soviet Union, but also to themselves. This is because the USSR will always be able to match any steps the West takes with commensurate retaliatory measures, as the leaders of our state have declared on more than one occasion.

At present, the economic, scientific, technical, and military potential of the USSR and the United States is such that seeking to achieve military superiority is merely a delusion. The Soviet Union will not permit anyone to achieve military superiority over it. The United States has tried repeatedly to gain military superiority and to dictate its terms to us. However, this policy that was implemented throughout decades has reached a deadlock. Now Washington is trying to overtake the USSR via space. However, here too it can be said with utmost responsibility that it will be disappointed. There is nothing that the United States can do that the Soviet Union cannot match. The United States will not be able to exhaust us by means of the arms race, it will not achieve superiority over us through the deployment of space strike arms.

However, the present level of the nuclear balance of the opposing sides is disproportionately high. The continuation of the nuclear arms race and particularly its extension to space could increase this danger to such a level where even approximate parity ceases to be a restraining factor. Consequently, the main task now is to sharply decrease the level of military confrontation. This is the objective of the Soviet programs for the complete elimination of nuclear weapons by the year 2000 and the reduction of all components of the Warsaw Pact and NATO ground forces and tactical aviation deployed in Europe from the Atlantic to the Urals, put forward by M.S. Gorbachev on 15 January and 18 April this year, respectively.

The USSR backs up its approach to ensuring lasting peace with practical steps such as its pledge not to be the first to use nuclear weapons; its unilateral halting of the deployment of medium-range missiles in Europe and reducing their number; and extending twice its unilateral moratorium on nuclear explosions.

However, the course toward peace and disarmament actively pursued by the CPSU and the Soviet state has not met with the U.S. Administration's support.

The complex and tense military-political situation and the growing threat of war for which the world's imperialist circles are to blame demand that the defense capability of the Soviet Union be strengthened and the combat might of its Armed Forces be maintained at the appropriate level. While doing everything necessary to consolidate peace, the CPSU and the Soviet Government are paying unremitting attention to maintaining the country's defense potential at the appropriate level and enhancing the combat readiness and combat capability of the Soviet Armed Forces.

In accordance with the decisions of the 27th CPSU Congress, the Soviet Army and Navy are being equipped with modern weapons and combat hardware. The command and political personnel of all components is constantly mastering the science of defeating a strong and perfidious enemy, training the troops and naval forces on the ground, in the air, and at sea, and enhancing their combat skills. Extensive and purposeful ideological and political-educational work is under way to inculcate high political and moral qualities in the personnel and to maintain military order and strict military discipline in every unit and on every ship. In enhancing the combat readiness of the Army and the Navy an important place is assigned to troop and force management at all levels, ensuring its reliability, firmness, and continuity. In implementing the decisions of the 27th CPSU Congress and strictly following Lenin's behests about the defense of the socialist fatherland, the servicemen of our Army and Navy see their main task in reliably protecting the peaceful labor of the Soviet people and the fraternal people of the allied countries. In this they are guided by our party's statement made at the congress: The Soviet Union is not seeking to gain greater security than others have, but neither will it agree to a lesser security. This key conclusion of the congress is a guideline for action for Soviet servicemen.

Celebrating Victory Day, Army and Navy servicemen profess their full support for the congress decisions and the domestic and foreign policy of the CPSU and the Soviet state and assure us that they will spare no effort in order to reliably protect peace and Soviet people's security.

/7358

CSO: 5200/1366

U.S.-USSR GENEVA TALKS

KARPOV COMMENTS ON PROSPECTS FOR CURRENT ROUND

. Arrival Statement

PM071326 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 7 May 86 First Edition p 4

[TASS report: "For The Geneva Talks"]

[Text] Geneva, 6 May -- The USSR delegation arrived here today to hold the fifth round of talks with the U.S. delegation on nuclear and space arms.

In a statement made on his arrival in Geneva, delegation leader V. P. Karpov said that the Soviet side has submitted detailed specific proposals at the talks in all three areas -- on space, strategic offensive arms, and medium-range arms in Europe. These proposals entirely and fully accord with the task of realizing the mandate of the talks agreed on earlier with the United States.

The delegation has clear instructions to strive at the talks for specific solutions to the questions under discussion on the basis of equality and identical security and in the interests of strengthening world peace. Of course, the reciprocity of our partners -- the American side -- is needed to achieve results.

In conclusion V.P. Karpov expressed gratitude on behalf of the USSR delegation to the residents and the authorities of the canton and city of Geneva for their invariable hospitality.

GDR TV Interview

DW082107 East Berlin Television Service in German 1845 GMT 8 May 86

["Exclusive" interview with Viktor Karpov by correspondent Dieter Wahl at the Soviet UN mission in Geneva on 8 May -- recorded in Russian with superimposed German translation]

[Text] [Wahl] Comrade Ambassador, do you see any chances of success of the fifth round of talks?

[Karpov] I think there are objective chances. They lie in the international situation and in the processes that are dictated to the United States and the Soviet Union regarding the necessity of achieving agreement on the limitation and reduction of armaments. The arms race has at present reached a stage where it cannot guarantee

security for the United States or the Soviet Union. That is the main reason why the United States and the Soviet Union must reach an agreement. As you know, there is an accord on principle between the United States and the Soviet Union. It is laid down in the Soviet-U.S. joint statement of 21 November 1985, on the results of the summit meeting between Mikhail Gorbachev and President Reagan. We must now seriously start putting those accords into practice and turn them into concrete agreements. That is the problem.

[Wahl] What in your view is special about this round of negotiations?

[Karpov] I would formulate it as follows: The special quality of this round of negotiations lies in the fact that it is a routine round where a solution must be reached. That equally applied to the first and all subsequent rounds. However, valuable time is passing with every round -- time during which the arms race is about to overtake the results of the negotiations, that is to say, possible results of an agreement on the limitation and reduction of armaments. That is dangerous, is it not? The longer that state of affairs lasts in which the most important problems of the end of the arms race on earth and its prevention in space remain unresolved, the more dangerous the international situation becomes and the more difficult it is to resolve the problems that our delegations are entrusted with.

[Wahl] Which problems discussed in the talks do you consider to be the most important? Which one should be resolved first?

[Karpov] I think that all problems discussed in the negotiations on nuclear arms and space weapons are urgent and important. To begin with, that applies to the necessity of preventing an arms race in space, because of space is turned into an arena of military competition, and what is more, if it is turned into an arena of large-scale arms race in space as a complement -- so to speak -- to the nuclear arms race on earth, it is clear that the danger of war, the danger of a nuclear war will grow. At present the United States and the Soviet Union have stockpiled large quantities of strategic offensive nuclear weapons. Reducing them has become an objective necessity, the necessity of putting the program of nuclear disarmament into practice by the year 2000, as presented by Mikhail Gorbachev on 15 January. In that respect, we suggest to the United States that we make progress as quickly and as resolutely as possible. It is their turn now.

Let me say a word on nuclear armaments in Europe. We, the European states, view Europe as our house. We live in it. Who else but us should be primarily concerned about the strengthening of European security. To begin with, we suggest that the U.S. and Soviet intermediate-range missiles in Europe be liquidated as a first step toward freeing Europe from nuclear weapons and toward strengthening its security. We make no preconditions whatsoever. We only say that to allow that process to materialize the United States not supply its intermediate-range strategic missiles to other countries. Britain and France, the two other European nuclear powers, should commit themselves not to increase their nuclear arms potential. On that condition, we are ready to fully liquidate all intermediate-range missiles in the European part of the Soviet Union, if the United States does the same. Naturally, that would be an enormous step on the road toward reducing the danger of the outbreak of a nuclear war on the European continent.

So you see that all problems are important and urgent and they all must be resolved. We want them to be resolved immediately.

[Wahl] There are some circles in the West that want to misuse the Chernobyl incident to disturb the negotiations. What can and must be said about that?

[Karpov] The sad and annoying incident at the Chernobyl nuclear power plant is at present being carefully analyzed to allow us to take realistic measures for preventing such incidents in the future. Measures are being taken for overcoming the consequences of the accident. The attempts by some Western circles at misusing that problem to complicate the solution of nuclear arms reductions are out of place. The problems of nuclear arms reductions are not directly related to the problem of the peaceful use of nuclear energy. Therefore, they are attempts by unsuitable means. They only prove that those who use such pretexts do not want to agree on the reduction and abolition of nuclear weapons.

[Wahl] Thank you very much, Comrade Ambassador.

[Karpov] What a pity that I could not say it all in German, next time perhaps.

'Ball in U.S. Court'

PM090903 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 9 May 86 First Edition p 4

[Text] Geneva, 8 May -- Talks on nuclear and space weapons between the USSR and the United States resumed here today with a plenary session of the delegations. The USSR delegation is headed by V.P. Karpov and the U.S. delegation by M. Kampelman.

Talking to journalists before the opening of the session, Karpov said that progress in the talks is possible and that the Soviet delegation intends to contribute to it. There are now on the negotiating table concrete Soviet proposals on all three groups of questions under discussion and these proposals are paving the way to an accord. In this way, the leader of the Soviet delegation stressed, the ball is in the court of the U.S. delegation. Their earlier proposals, made in early November last year, cannot be the basis of accord and the U.S. side is well aware of this.

/7358

CSO: 5200/1366

U.S.-USSR GENEVA TALKS

SOVIET COMMENTARIES ON MAY REOPENING OF TALKS

U.S. 'Evaded Serious Discussion'

LD080849 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0600 GMT 8 May 86

[Correspondent Vladimir Dmitriyev report]

[Text] The fifth round of the Soviet-U.S. Talks on nuclear and space armaments will begin today in Geneva. The activity of the Soviet delegation at the talks is based on the major initiatives in the field of disarmament, especially the program of liquidating nuclear armaments put forth by the Soviet Union. Our country proposes reaching mutually acceptable agreements on space weapons, strategic offensive weapons, and medium-range missiles in Europe. Here is a report from Geneva by our correspondent Vladimir Dmitriyev:

The fourth round of the talks, which was completed 2 months ago, as you know, was not crowned with success. The U.S. representatives, acting against the decisions of the Geneva summit, evaded serious, businesslike discussion of the problems. As not long before the next round, the United States has undertaken aggressive acts openly aimed at whipping up international tension. Such are the real, alarming facts. The Soviet side is filled with resolve for the next round, just as it always has been, to work for practical solutions to the questions under discussion based on equality and equal security, and in the interests of strengthening universal peace. It is also necessary that the U.S. side display goodwill and a desire to seek mutually acceptable solutions.

U.S., Soviet Statements Contrasted

LD081119 Moscow TASS in English 1100 GMT 8 May 86

[Text] Geneva May 8 TASS -- By TASS correspondent Yevgeniy Korzhev:

The talks on nuclear and space armaments between the USSR and the United States were resumed here today.

According to analysts, the current round may prove to be more difficult and complicated than the previous ones. And the fault is not with the Soviet side. The entire world knows of the large package of Soviet initiatives the implementation of which would ensure an end of the arms race on earth and its prevention in outer space.

The Soviet delegation put forward detailed concrete proposals, totally in accord with the mandate agreed upon by the two sides, on all three subjects of the Geneva talks -- space, strategic offensive and medium-range armaments.

The United States displays a different approach, both to the question of limiting the arms race and to the problems of universal peace and security.

In the period of two months following the completion of the fourth round, Washington undertook a number of steps directly contradicting the "spirit of Geneva". Suffice it to mention the continuation of American nuclear testing, condemned universally, the continuing threats against Nicaragua and the piratic attack on Libya.

The American Administration also undertook a series of hostile, provocative actions against the Soviet Union. As to the essence of the items on the agenda of the Geneva talks, the Americans prefer either to keep silent or limit themselves to empty, demagogic declarations.

Quite indicative in this respect were the statements made by the two delegations on arriving in Geneva. The head of the Soviet delegation, Viktor Karpov, pointed out that his delegation had clear instructions to strive for concrete decisions at the talks on the questions under discussion on the basis of equality and equal security in the interests of strengthening universal peace. On the international situation, he observed with regret that the United States was undertaking lately actions that were openly directed at heightening tension and enhancing the threat of war.

On the contrary, the American statement, made public a little later, was reduced, as always, to the attempts to justify its unreadiness for serious talks, specifically with the help of a loose interpretation of the agreements reached at the Geneva summit meeting.

The journalists were puzzled by the additional remarks by Max Kampelman, head of the American delegation. He said that the Soviet delegation had no moral or political right to criticise the U.S. actions against Libya, and accompanied his pronouncement by rude anti-Soviet remarks. The Washington ambassador was clearly sensitive to the issue -- the piratic attack on Libyan cities sparked off extensive indignation against the United States in all the continents. His tone, however, as well as the obsession to impose on others the solution of the questions of law and morality were hardly appropriate in advance of the important negotiations.

Soviet Proposals Summarized

LD031412 Moscow TASS in English 1353 GMT 8 May 86

[Text] Moscow May 8 TASS -- TASS Military News Analyst Vladimir Chernyshev writes:

The fifth round of the Soviet-American talks on nuclear and space weapons opened in Geneva. What are the record sheets of the sides as they are resuming this extremely important dialogue? What contribution has each of them made to the development of a base for further progress? Do the instructions received by the delegations ensure progress? These questions undoubtedly are of interest to the world public.

The Soviet Union has made detailed and concrete proposals on all the three areas of the talks, space weapons, strategic offensive weapons and medium-range weapons in Europe.

These proposals fully meet the task of implementing the mandate of the talks agreed with the United States earlier. Moreover, the program of the stage-by-stage ridding of the world of nuclear weapons by the end of this century, formulated by Mikhail Gorbachev in his statement on January 15, makes it possible already now to identify a clear prospect for the practical implementation of the ultimate goal formulated in the Soviet-American statement of January 8, 1985, the elimination of nuclear weapons totally and everywhere.

Guiding itself by the agreement achieved at the Soviet-American summit in Geneva on accelerating the talks, the USSR has taken constructive steps to initiate the process of nuclear arms reduction immediately. For instance, already now, outside the context of strategic weapons and space weapons, the problem of the complete elimination of the Soviet and American medium-range missiles in Europe could be resolved in the first place to mutual satisfaction and there would be no need for the further presence of Soviet operational-tactical missiles of increased range at sites at which they were deployed in response to the stationing of American medium-range missiles in Europe. The Soviet proposals could provide the starting point for achieving accord on a 50 per cent reduction in the nuclear weapons of the USSR and the USA reaching each other's territories on the condition that outer space is not militarized. The USSR has thus made a substantial contribution to the development of the potential for progress. If the other side displays goodwill and readiness to search for mutually acceptable decisions, the Soviet position offers realistic opportunities for an accord.

The Soviet delegation has arrived for the next round of the talks with clear instructions to seek concrete decisions on questions under discussion on the basis of equality and equal security and in the interest of stronger world peace.

The United States for its part has not yet done anything to translate the accords reached at the Soviet-American summit and the joint Soviet-American statement into practical deeds. The Washington officials promise some reductions in the nuclear systems demanding as an "advance" a blessing for the spread of the arms race into space.

Meanwhile, the non-militarization of space is an essential precondition for deep cuts in nuclear weapons and for their eventual elimination.

The instructions of the U.S. delegation for the current round, as statements by U.S. Administration officials indicate, do not call for any constructive revisions in the U.S. negotiating position. The delegation was instructed to offer, instead of a discussion on a ban on space-strike weapons, a dialogue on the relationship between strategic offensive and defensive weapons, that is, to try to have "rules" for the arms race in this area drafted. Washington's proposals on strategic nuclear armaments, tabled last November and obviously designed to give unilateral advantage to the United States, have not been revised either.

There is not even an inkling of respect for the principle of equality and equal security in the U.S. proposals on medium-range missiles. Washington officials have gone so far as cynically characterizing revisions of their position as "talks with ourselves." Clearly, this attitude to the talks and the White House instructions to the delegation can in no way help to create the base for advance and doom the talks to a stalemate.

It is high time for Washington to come to grips with the problem and take a serious approach in Geneva to the practical implementation of the mutual obligations assumed by the USSR and the USA at the summit meeting. Progress at the talks will become reality only if the United States actually joins the Soviet Union in its constructive efforts to work out mutually acceptable accords.

U.S. Doing 'Nothing'

LDC81743 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1445 GMT 8 May 86

[From "The World Today" program presented by Georgiy Zubkov]

[Text] In Geneva today, the latest round of the Soviet-U.S. negotiations on nuclear and space armaments opened today. This is the fifth round.

From the start of the talks, our country has been striving to guide matters toward the conclusion of effective accords on a mutually acceptable basis, a result of which would be the prevention of the arms race in space and an end to the one on earth. At the basis of our position at the talks lies the program for the step-by-step elimination of nuclear weapons proposed by Comrade Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee in his statement on 15 January.

The Soviet delegation to the Geneva talks is led by Karpov, and the U.S. delegation by Kampelman. IN a conversation with journalists before the beginning of the session today, Karpov said that progress at the talks is possible, and the Soviet delegation intends to promote it.

On the negotiating table are specific Soviet proposals on all three groups of questions under discussion: space, strategic and offensive weapons, and medium-range weapons in Europe. The proposals open the way to the achievement of an accord. Thus, it is now up to the U.S. side. Despite the positive accord achieved during the Soviet-U.S. summit meeting on fundamental questions as well as on accelerating the Geneva talks, the U.S. side is doing virtually nothing so far to implement these decisions.

Reagan Statement Hit

PM131236 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 10 May 86 First Edition p 5

[Vitaliy Gan dispatch under the rubric "Commentator's Column": "Washington and Geneva"]

[Text] Washington -- The Soviet-American talks on nuclear and space arms have resumed in Geneva. The people of the world rightly expect from their participants specific accords capable of arresting the slide toward the nuclear abyss, checking the dangerous buildup of militarist preparations, and preventing them from spreading to space,

The USSR's stance at the Geneva talks is well known. Our country has put forward a whole range of concrete proposals aimed at delivering mankind from the nuclear threat within this century and sharply reducing other types of arms. Regrettably, the actions of the United States so far inspire no particular hope that rapid progress will be achieved in this vitally important area. Washington's steps such as its refusal to joint the Soviet moratorium on nuclear tests, its efforts to continue its "star wars" preparations at any price, the program for the modernization of NATO's chemical arsenals, and other steps in the same direction testify to the U.S. intention to continue to pursue the mirage of military superiority.

The same applies to the U.S. President's statement released on the eve of the resumption of the Geneva talks. It would be futile to look for constructive new proposals and

ideas in this statement. There is nothing in this statement to indicate Washington's readiness to abandon its old obstructionist stance and to back up its declaration of "commitment" to the cause of curbing the arms race with practical steps.

Instead, the statement abounds in the old demagogical expatiations with which the United States is trying to cover up its unwillingness to come to an agreement with the USSR based on the principle of equality and identical security. Instead of submitting concrete initiatives in the field of disarmament, Washington is trying to prove that the absence of progress at the talks is due to...the Soviet position. Attempts are being made to accuse our country of noncompliance with the commitments enshrined in the joint Soviet-American statement on the results of the Geneva summit of November 1985.

The discrepancy, to put it mildly, between these claims and the reality is obvious. After all, it was the Soviet Union that put forward in mid-January the comprehensive phased program for delivering mankind from nuclear arms. Unable to counter the Soviet initiative with anything sufficiently constructive or radical, Washington came up with nothing better than rejecting it under far-fetched and clumsy pretexts. The President's statement once again indicates that the disarmament program put forward by the USSR is essentially unacceptable to the United States.

The dialogue in Geneva on the main problem of our time, the problem of diminishing the threat of war to the future of mankind, demands that its participants display truly historic responsibility. Regrettably, this is totally lacking in the President's statement.

/7358

CSO: 5200/1366

U.S.-USSR GENEVA TALKS

TASS REPORTS SPACE ARMS MEETINGS HELD 13-20 MAY

Space Arms Group 13 May

LD131136 Moscow TASS in English 1107 GMT 13 May 86

[Text] Geneva, May 13 TASS--The group on space arms has met for a session here today within the framework of the Soviet-U.S. talks on nuclear and space armaments.

Strategic Arms Group 14 May

LD141105 Moscow TASS in English 1103 GMT 14 May 86

[Text] Geneva May 14 TASS--A meeting of the group on strategic arms was held here today within the framework of the Soviet-American talks on nuclear and space arms.

Plenary, INF Sessions 15 May

LD151159 Moscow TASS in English 1152 GMT 15 May 86

[Text] Geneva May 15 TASS--The delegations of the Soviet Union and the United States to the talks on nuclear and space armaments held a plenary meeting here today at the initiative of the Soviet delegation.

On the same day, the group on medium-range armaments held a meeting within the framework of the Soviet-American talks on nuclear and space armaments.

Space Arms Group 20 May

LD201116 Moscow TASS in English 1059 GMT 20 May 86

[Text] Geneva May 20 TASS--The group on space arms held a meeting here today in the framework of Soviet-U.S. talks on nuclear and space weapons.

/7358

CSO: 5200/1366

U.S.-USSR GENEVA TALKS

SOVIET FOREIGN MINISTRY PRESS CONFERENCE ON GENEVA TALKS

Radio Broadcast

LD161730 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1440 GMT 16 May 86

[Station Commentator Viktor Levin report in an unscheduled bulletin on the 16 May press conference for Soviet and foreign journalists held at the USSR Ministry of Foreign Affairs with the participation of Comrade Bessmertnykh, deputy minister of foreign affairs; and Colonel-General Chervov, head of a directorate of the General Staff of the Armed Forces of the Soviet Union; conducted by Comrade Lomeyko, head of the Press Department of the USSR Ministry of Foreign Affairs; passage within quotation marks recorded]

[Text] Comrade Bessmertnykh made a statement at the beginning of the press conference. Among other things he said the following:

"[Bessmertnykh] Conjectures have once again been circulated by the U.S. Administration concerning the position of the Soviet Union at the talks on nuclear and space armaments. Official U.S. representatives, like Paul Nitze, chief adviser to the U.S. President and the U.S. secretary of state on issues of arms limitation; Defense Secretary Weinberger; and the President of the United States himself assert that the American side has supposedly put forward some new far-reaching proposals at the Geneva talks and that Moscow is allegedly still not replying to these proposals. Thus, they want to create the impression that it is not the United States but it is someone else who is putting a brake on progress in Geneva and, in a wider context, that it is not the United States but someone else who is developing the arms race in all fields, one twist after another. That is what they say in Washington. But this is what the facts say:

The Soviet Union, proceeding from the urgent task of freeing mankind from the nuclear threat, proposed an integral program for elimination of nuclear weapons and other types of weapons of mass destruction completely and worldwide by the year 2000. It put forward new proposals for banning and destroying chemical weapons and also for a considerable reduction in all components of land-forces and tactical air forces in Europe.

"In the Political Report to the 27th CPSU Congress, Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev, the general secretary, presented the foundations, worked out in an innovative and creative way, for an all-embracing system of international security. Displaying statesmanlike wisdom and a high level of responsibility, the Soviet leadership announced a unilateral moratorium on the implementation of all nuclear explosions more than 9 months ago. As

Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev stated on 14 May, the decision has been made to extend this moratorium until 6 August of this year. This is a bold decision that provides a real chance of halting the nuclear arms race.

"That is not even the full record of service -- if I may use that expression -- of the Soviet Union on questions of disarmament over the past few months alone. What has the United States done during the same period? It has done a lot, but what it has done has not been in the field of arms limitation and reduction but in the field of an increase in all types of armaments, in working out concepts and doctrines suitable for justifying the militarization of space and aggressive methods involving the use of force in foreign policy.

"The unwillingness of the United States to undertake anything realistic in order to slow down the arms race is being shown in a particularly glaring way in the issue of ending tests of nuclear weapons.

"Finally one could draw the following conclusions:

"The United States has received from the USSR a precise official reply to its proposals of 1 November 1985, and of 24 February 1986. Assertions that this is not the case are calculated to conceal the lack of willingness on the part of the United States to work constructively in Geneva.

"The line that has been implemented so far by the United States at the talks on nuclear and space armaments was not intended to achieve accords. It knocked the ground from under the possibility of achieving such accords and for a businesslike and serious examination of the Soviet proposals put forward at Geneva, revealing by the same token the total bankruptcy of the assertions by official U.S. figures about their efforts to seek for accords on arms limitation.

"The U.S. side has in essence done everything to stifle that impulse that was given to the talks on nuclear and space arms by the Soviet-U.S. summit meeting in Geneva. And nevertheless, the U.S. Administration does have the opportunity to confirm its words by deeds. At the moment, when the Soviet Union has prolonged its unilateral moratorium on carrying out nuclear explosions for the third time and has proposed to the U.S. leadership, in Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev's words, "to demonstrate by their actions their concern for people's life and health," the U.S. Government must make use of the chance being offered it and join this historically important action by the Soviet Union. The Soviet Union, in accordance with the accord reached at the Geneva summit meeting, has put forward a wide range of far-reaching constructive proposals on all aspects of the talks: space, strategic arms, and medium-range arms. This has been done on the basis of an honest and objective regard for the security interests of the United States as well as those of the West European countries. A fundamentally new situation has arisen, which could shift the Geneva negotiations from their standstill, if the U.S. side is ready to go for mutually acceptable compromises."

[Levin] Then the participants in the press conference replied to questions. The first touched upon the Soviet Union's position on medium-range missiles in Asia. Comrade Chervov replied:

[Chervov] The Soviet position also fully settles the issue of medium-range missiles in Asia. You are all familiar with the Soviet program for nuclear disarmament. In accordance with this program Soviet medium-range missiles in the East will be totally eliminated at the second stage of this program's implementation. At the present time,

Soviet medium-range missiles in the East are countered by the group of U.S. medium-range missiles, of which there are over 400 in this region. Thus, in expounding the readiness to solve the issue of Soviet missiles in the East, the question reasonably arises that the problem about what to do with U.S. nuclear medium range missiles in this region must also be solved. Under a mutual obligation the problem of not moving missiles from Asia to Europe within the Soviet Union, and in the United States -- from the United States to another area in the world closer to the Soviet Union -- this problem is quite solvable."

[Levin] Question: Has an official answer been received from the United States to the prolongation of the moratorium? Comrade Bessmertnykh replies:

[Bessmertnykh] There has so far been no official reaction from the U.S. Administration to this new proposal of ours. I should say, though, that U.S. officials, including representatives of the White House, are saying that a moratorium on ending nuclear weapons [as heard], again, does not suit the United States. I should note that we cannot find anything new in what has lately been said in public by representatives of the U.S. Administration, while we wait for the official government reaction. I would like to stress that the U.S. Government really is being given a good chance to show by deed, in practice, for all to see and note, that it is ready to put the brakes on the arms race and later to stop it. A better method -- the very simplest one subject to monitoring -- simply does not exist."

[Levin] Question: The U.S. side speaks about stabilizing and destabilizing strategic weapons and it turns out that the American weapons are stabilizing ones, while the Soviet ones are destabilizing. What can you say about this? A reply is given by Comrade Chervov:

[Chervov] In fact this term is the invention of the current U.S. Administration. The administrations of Nixon, Ford, and Carter did not use such a concept. And if we go back roughly 20 years and look at the strategic weapons situation, when the United States had 1,000 ICBM's, 656 SLBM's, and about 700 heavy bombers, plus more than 1,000 forward-based nuclear systems around the Soviet Union -- while the Soviet Union had just roughly 600 ICBM's -- it never even came into the Americans' heads then to say that our ICBM's were destabilizing. They have turned out to be destabilizing now, at a time when we have reached parity and we are marching shoulder to shoulder, as they say, in strategic weapons, in the strategic sphere." The United States is now of the opinion that everything that the Soviet Union has more of and which comprises its chief combat potential in strategic weapons -- all this is assessed by the Americans as destabilizing and subject to liquidation. Everything that the American side has more of in this area -- chiefly SLBM's and heavy bombers equipped with long-range cruise missiles, each capable of carrying 20-30 cruise missiles -- all these are considered stabilizing weapons in the interests of peace and strengthening security. Even the MX missiles, 10 of which will be put into position this year, each having 10 warheads of 700 kilotons each -- even if the total power of each missile is approximately equal to that of all the explosions that took place during the Second World War, in other words one missile will be equal to the whole Second World War -- the Americans are still of the opinion that it is a guardian of peace. What naivety! What absurdity! But essentially speaking, all the strategic weapons are, in terms of their combat potential and combat effectiveness, approximately the same.

Take the ballistic missiles of the Trident-1 and Trident-2 submarines. Their combat efficiency is exactly the same as that of our ICBM's -- in range, in accuracy and in warhead capacity. And as far as their survivability is concerned, then, of course,

that is considerably higher than stationary ICBM's. But the Americans keep quiet about this. It is of no advantage to them to say this. But in essence, it is the case, that if they were to declare that all strategic means are now comparable in efficiency that means that it is necessary to evaluate the U.S. triad and the Soviet triad and to correlate them in complex, as a single unit, to regard them at the talks as a package. And it is precisely this that the U.S. side does not wish to do. "By the way, it is precisely here that the main reason lies for our not being able to find common language with the U.S. side. It is possible to reach an agreement on strategic armaments -- of course, with a ban on space, on space strike weapons -- it is possible to reach an agreement only on condition that the U.S. and Soviet triad are put on the table and that they are regarded as a complex. Because now, in essence, there is no difference in the combat efficiency of strategic nuclear means." [Levin] Replies to a number of other questions were given at the press conference. [Moscow Television Service in Russian at 1700 GMT on 16 May in its "Vremya" newscast carries a report on the press conference which is shorter than the radio version but adds the following: "Replies were given to journalists' questions at the press conference. Answering one of them concerning the extension of the moratorium on Soviet tests to 6 August by the Soviet Union, Colonel General Chervov head of the Directorate of USSR Armed Forces General Staff said:

["I would reply to you in this way: That this is in fact a new way of acting, a new way of thinking, a new political approach by the Soviet leadership in the nuclear age. This was what was discussed at the 27th CPSU Congress. This is a daring step. In making this decision the Soviet Government was simultaneously taking into account the wishes of many governments, including those of capitalist countries, the wishes of the world public and of all peace-loving forces on our planet."]

U.S. Planning To Violate SALT II

LD161708 Moscow TASS in English 1645 GMT 16 May 86

[Text] Moscow May 16 TASS -- There is more and more talk in Washington about the United States' withdrawal from the SALT-2 treaty, which is in preparation, Aleksandr Bessmertnykh, deputy minister of foreign affairs of the USSR, said at a press conference today, responding to questions put by journalists.

The Soviet side proceeds from the assumption that abiding on a mutual basis by the provisions of the treaty, which blocks the quantitative and qualitative perfection of the more powerful armaments, would be of no small importance of maintaining the strategic balance in the future as well and to ensuring auspicious conditions for working out new accords on limiting and reducing nuclear armaments.

The USSR's position as regards the SALT-2 treaty will, certainly, depend on how the matter will stand with respect to preventing the arms race in outer space, and observing by the United States of the ABM Treaty.

The United States' further intentions with regard to this treaty are to be checked when another U.S. submarine of the "Ohio" type will begin sea trials, which is reported to take place late in May, the deputy minister of foreign affairs of the USSR said.

Thus, the United States would, if corresponding measures are not taken, exceed the established limit of 1,200 units on intercontinental ballistic missiles and submarine-launched ballistic missiles with multiple independently targetable re-entry vehicles.

For the United States to comply with this limit, it should dismantle the corresponding number of the already existing arms (either two "Poseidon" submarines or the corresponding number of "Minuteman-2" intercontinental ballistic missiles).

The intentions of the U.S. side will apparently be checked for the second time by the end of the year when as a result of the equipment of bombers with long-range cruise missiles the United States will approach the treaty ceiling of 1,320 units for MIRVed ballistic missiles and heavy bombers with cruise missiles.

There is now talk in Washington to the effect that if in the first case the United States will, possibly, abide by the limit, in the second -- it will not do it. Simultaneously, it is planned to launch a propaganda campaign charging the USSR with its alleged "non-compliance" with SALT-2. The purpose is to find a pretext to lift from the United States the treaty restrictions which were agreed upon by the sides.

So, the point at issue is the intention to violate the treaty most flagrantly, to withdraw from it through relieving itself of one or another of its provisions as soon as they become a hindrance to new U.S. military programmes. Should this happen, the entire responsibility for the consequences would rest squarely with the United States. The USSR would make corresponding conclusions for itself and take measures to protect its security and to prevent the balance established by the treaty from being tipped.

Soviet Stand on Talks

LD161629 Moscow TASS in English 1529 GMT 16 May 86

["Geneva Talks: Facts and Fiction" -- TASS item identifier]

[Text] Moscow May 16 TASS -- The U.S. Administration has lately begun anew to spread rumours about the Soviet position at the talks on nuclear and space weapons. Aleksandr Bessmertnykh, a deputy minister of foreign affairs of the USSR, said at a press conference for Soviet and foreign journalists here today. In this way they want to create the impression, he continued, that it is not the USA but someone else that is holding back progress at the Geneva talks. But this is not so. Actually, during the previous four rounds the American side did not offer anything new as compared with what it said from the outset and what was absolutely unacceptable. This holds true of the U.S. positions on outer space, on strategic arms and on medium-range nuclear weapons.

The claims of the American side that the USA introduced something fresh in the talks on November 1, 1985, and on February 24, 1986, are at odds with reality. Equally far-fetched are the statements of the U.S. Administration that the Soviet Union has not responded to the above American proposals. The deputy foreign minister pointed out that way back during talks with U.S. Secretary of State Shultz in Moscow in early November 1985, the Soviet side had given an official view of the American proposals and demonstrated in detail why they were unacceptable. Then, the Soviet side produced at the Geneva talks themselves a detailed characterization of the U.S. proposals.

It was pointed out, inter alia, that the U.S. proposal of November 1 circumvented the main question, that of averting the arms race in space. By substituting the value concept of "stabilizing the relationship between offensive and defensive weapons" for the problem of averting the arms race in outer space, the USA actually would like to give legitimacy to the arms race both in space and on earth.

As for the arguments of the American side on strategic offensive weapons, at a closer look they mean a buildup of these armaments, though they seem to be speaking about halving them. Instead of the aggregate level of 6,000 nuclear warheads on strategic delivery vehicles mentioned by the American side as a ceiling for our countries, the United States, if its proposal were accepted, would have increased the number of its nuclear warheads to more than 15,000.

Moreover, long range sea-launched cruise missiles (about 4,000 units) would not be restricted at all. The American proposals, if they were accepted, would wreck the existing structure of the Soviet strategic forces while that of the U.S. strategic forces would be preserved.

As for an "intermediate agreement" on medium-range missiles under the proposals, tabled by the American side on November 1, 1985, the United States would secure an opportunity to increase drastically, more than two-fold, the number of nuclear warheads on its medium-range missiles in Europe while the Soviet missiles would have to be reduced.

Washington's proposals by the closure of the fourth round of the talks did not contain anything constructive either and were actually equivalent to a repetition of the unacceptable positions presented by the U.S. delegation earlier. The American side responded to the Soviet radical proposal on the complete elimination of the Soviet and U.S. medium-range missiles in Europe with its infamous "zero option".

The American side, the Soviet deputy foreign minister states, has been doing whatever it can to quench the impetus given to the talks on nuclear and space weapons by the Soviet-American Geneva summit. Yet the U.S. Administration still has a chance to back its words with deeds.

Now that the USSR has announced the third extension of its unilateral moratorium on nuclear explosions and offered the U.S. leadership, in the words of Mikhail Gorbachev, "to demonstrate by action its care for human life and health", the U.S. Government should use the chance offered it and joint the historical action of the Soviet Union.

If Washington really wanted to contribute to the Soviet efforts to break the deadlock at the talks on nuclear and space weapons, it could do so by reverting to a business-like and constructive discussion of all questions at the recently opened fifth round of those talks.

We now have a fundamentally new situation, which can break the stalemate at the Geneva talks if the American side is prepared to seek mutually acceptable compromises.

Lomeyko on Chernobyl, Western 'Psychosis'

LD161926 Moscow TASS in English 1846 GMT 16 May 86

[Text] Moscow May 16 TASS - Colonel General Nikolay Chervov, a department chief of the General Staff of the Soviet Armed Forces, who took part in today's press conference, said in reply to a question about the Soviet Union's approach to medium-range missiles in Asia that that approach was presented in the Soviet programme for the complete elimination of nuclear weapons. Such missiles in the east of the Soviet Union would be eliminated at the second stage of the implementation of that programme.

The Soviet medium-range missiles in that region are countering U.S. medium-range systems deployed in the Far East. The USSR agrees to tackle the question of its medium-range missiles in Asia but the question of what to do with the American medium-range system in the Far East should be resolved simultaneously.

A French radio correspondent asked what problems had been caused to the disarmament talks by the Chernobyl accident and what the soviet reaction was to the measures taken by the EEC. Vladimir Lomeyko, chief of the Foreign Ministry's Press Department, who participated in the press conference, said: "The Soviet Union's position of principle on the Chernobyl accident was presented in the address of Mikhail Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, on Soviet television. The accident should become a lesson to the entire world community, first and foremost because it graphically demonstrated that a formidable danger is posed by nuclear energy when it breaks free. In this situation a new approach and new thinking should be displayed by everyone.

The Soviet Union has again extended its unilateral moratorium on nuclear explosions and offered the USA immediate talks. Chernobyl is an accident and Nevada explosions are a deliberate policy of statesmen who would not listen to the voice of reason or to the demands of the world public.

"Exploiting the Chernobyl accident, the mass media and politicians in a number of Western countries, primarily in the USA, whipped up psychosis. Measures were taken by the self-same people as a result of that psychosis. That is why others cannot bear responsibility for this."

/7358

CSO: 5200/1366

U.S.-USSR GENEVA TALKS

USSR'S ARBATOV ASSAILS U.S. ATTITUDE

LD102127 Warsaw Television Service in Polish 2020 GMT 8 May 86

[Interview with Georgiy Arbatov, director of the United States of America and Canada Institute, by correspondent Jerzy Wajszczuk on 8 May; Arbatov and Wajszczuk in Russian fading into superimposed Polish translation; place not given -- recorded]

[Text] [Wajszczuk] Almost exactly a year ago we talked about the time factor in international relations, including Soviet-U.S. relations. Why, in your opinion, is the disarmament dialogue developing so slowly at the present time?

[Arbatov] Well, for relations to develop at all, and especially to develop quickly, both sides have to want it and, above all, they have to want disarmament. If that were so, this dialogue would develop much more quickly and move ahead altogether. What we have seen over the last year has in no way, I believe, dispersed the doubts that we have had, and continue to have, regarding the U.S. Administration's intentions toward disarmament negotiations. What are they? Is it a means to conceal their own intentions and shut up the opposition? A means to pacify those who are discontented and, in essence, a continuation of the arms race? I believe that the U.S. Administration is constantly hampering this dialogue, because, as Mikhail Gorbachev continually repeats, summit meetings are only useful if... [Arbatov changes thought] Which does not mean that he is setting down conditions, but it is sensible and arises from the norms of international relations, and at the same time conforming with the undertaking the two leaders made in Geneva. This kind of meeting serves to normalize the international situation and Soviet-U.S. relations, to halt the arms race, and to reduce the risk of a threat of nuclear war. And the year, or even the 6 months that have passed since Geneva have shown a lot in this sphere; specifically that the Soviet Union indeed attempts to give substance to what it says, to perceive in a new way many of the problems the world is facing, and to find a new approach to the security problem. Even now security concepts already have been worked out to meet the Americans half-way; to comprehend their problems and meet them half-way wherever possible in order to reach agreement. Examples of this are our statement of 15 January and many other proposals aimed precisely at that. But we have not noticed one, literally not one such positive move from the U.S. side.

[Wajszczuk] It seems to me that it was psychologically easier to speak of future events last year. Everything was ahead of us: Geneva, other negotiations. So hopes were ahead of us, while I believe that now, in spite of various achievements in the field and even Geneva, the world seemingly has become more complicated.

[Arbatov] Well, you know. That hope lives within us as long as we live. Thus I would not put it that way. Besides that, we have also witnessed many positive phenomena recently. All in all, the political process was given new momentum over the past year. A serious discussion was started around problems almost forgotten. And here, I believe, Soviet policy and Soviet initiatives have played an important role. Many issues were put in the appropriate light and it resulted from the political process. It is more difficult to conceal one's intentions. For example, let us take nuclear tests.

It always was said that the Russians were conducting more of those; however, they cannot say that any more. Much was said about arms control, and now that, too, is out. Therefore, it is becoming obvious to everyone that the U.S. Administration wants to continue the arms race. What else? This position is not supported by everyone as it leads to specific problems.

Much also was said about the SS-20 missiles, about Soviet superiority. Now we have presented proposals for their elimination similar to the U.S. one but the Americans immediately retreat. We are proposing almost exactly what they were proposing recently, while they at once draw back from it. This is also instructive for people.

We conduct policies stretching ahead a year or 6 months, or even further ahead because, after all, history did not begin with Reagan and it will not end with him. And the United States is not the only country in the world.

I also believe that the struggle presently developing between our states and the two systems, between the socialist community and NATO, also has another plane. Who has a more thorough, more realistic program that better answers mankind's needs? Is it the Soviet Union and its allies or the United States and its allies? The public's approach to many issues these days will depend on what they are being offered. After all, we and the United States account for merely 10 percent of the world population, leaving another 90 percent.

[Wajszczuk] How do you view what is described as the spirit of Geneva?

[Arbatov] In my opinion the spirit of Geneva is the undertaking made in Geneva, the undertaking to struggle for a breakthrough in international relations, in the situation as a whole, in turning away from the cold war and in changing over to the track of normal relations -- what we call detente. We will not insist on this term, as it has by now almost been turned into a vulgar concept in the United States. It is the concept of peaceful coexistence, improved relations. It can be described in a variety of ways, but the essence of the matter amounts to halting the totally unlimited arms race and renouncing every thing connected with the cold war. That is how I understand Geneva and therein lay its value. The first step in that direction was made there; not from the point of view of changing the very substance of relations but from the point of view of establishing premises for that. Such possibilities were created and unnecessary obstacles, which had made it impossible even to meet at a negotiating table, were removed.

What is the effect of this? So far, I have been disappointed. And I am not just expressing my own point of view. Comrade Gorbachev has recently spoken of this from many platforms, and very important ones at that. And I believe that this is understood equally in Poland and back home. All we ever see is pressure. Not a single military program has been given up and more and more money is demanded for armaments.

The behavior is, frankly, provocative. We proposed a moratorium, extended it -- we did that twice -- and we get, ostentatiously and provocatively, nuclear tests one after another.

On top of that, there are the events in Libya, U.S. warships sail into the Black Sea, into our territorial waters. Thus even less important events such as these clearly show the U.S. Administration's intentions, if not the President himself. I have no basis to attribute everything to him alone, although I find it difficult to imagine that things like that are not determined at the highest level.

It is now proposed to us to reduce our UN staff, contrary to the U.S. undertakings to guarantee normal working conditions for various UN missions. These demands concerning staff reductions, I believe, also apply to Poland and other socialist states.

That is how they behave and on top of that they get offended whenever the Soviet Union proposes anything openly; we at once get the offended look. Why? Because it is public diplomacy.

[Wajszczuk] How, in your opinion, do U.S. citizens perceive the Soviet Union's foreign policy?

[Arbatov] First of all, I would like to say that the Soviet Union's policies get passed over in silence there. One or two things do get through, for example the matter of our nuclear test moratorium. A little bit got through in connection with the 27th congress, but for all the Americans' pride in their free press, they have become amazingly conformist. There was the attack by Reagan and his side on ABC because it allowed our commentator to appear after Reagan's speech for 8 minutes. After that, everyone became quiet about the Soviet Union. There is very little information about the Soviet Union and it is very poor. Therefore, it is not just the man in the street, as they say, that has no idea about it. Amazing ignorance is also displayed by specialists and even many administration officials.

All the things that have been said on the Soviet Union's position regarding security, terrorism, economic security--the Americans simply don't know about them. I would go as far as saying that kind of ignorance is dangerous to live with in a nuclear era.

[Wajszczuk] And, my last question: The matter of Europe. It seems to me that after Mikhail Gorbachev's latest proposals in Berlin, Europe is becoming the center of international relations. What more needs to be done to move ahead?

[Arbatov] I believe that Western Europe itself should adopt an independent position. I hope it will be so, and soon. That would change much throughout the world.

[Wajszczuk] On behalf of the Polish viewers, I would like to thank you very much for meeting with us.

/7358

CSO: 5200/1366

U.S.-USSR GENEVA TALKS

MOSCOW TALK SHOW PONDER'S CHERNOBYL'S EFFECT ON U.S. STANCE

LD181733 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1130 GMT 18 May 86

["International Observers Roundtable" program, presented by Boris Andrianov, All-Union Radio foreign policy commentator; Dmitriy Antonovich Volskiy, member of the NOVOYE VREMYA editorial board; and Vadim Nikolayevich Nekrasov, KOMMUNIST International Observer]

[Excerpts] [Andrianov] This week Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev gave an address on Soviet television. He spoke of the misfortune that we suffered in Chernobyl where an accident happened at the atomic power station. This accident has brought pain to Soviet people and they have displayed deep humanity and genuine humanism, a high level of morality in their attitude to this extraordinary happening. The misfortune that happened at Chernobyl has moved the international public, too. Throughout the world as a whole, there has been an attitude of understanding over the misfortune that has befallen us and over our actions to deal with the accident in the serious situation that came about.

[Nekrasov] One therefore cannot ignore and leave outside one's political assessment the obvious way events at Chernobyl were received by governments, by political figures, and by the mass information media in several NATO countries, particularly the United States. They unfolded an unbridled anti-Soviet campaign, heaping up whole mountains of the most dishonest, spiteful falsehood; they engaged in shameful speculation about the accident that had taken place. Writing in this connection, William (Brown), editor of the journal (SURVEY) and an eminent Australian journalist and writer, called Western reaction to events in Chernobyl the most frenzied outburst of anti-Sovietism in recent years.

[Andrianov] Fanning a provocative rumpus, sowing panic among the population, they unleashed a special campaign in the West around the so-called lack of information about the accident at Chernobyl. And what is more, the organizers of this campaign deliberately gave it a political content, making it deeply political in character. Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev noted the far-fetched nature of this issue in his address on Soviet television, and for purposes of comparison, recalled the way the U.S. authorities behaved when a tragedy occurred at the Three Mile Island atomic power station in Pennsylvania on 28 March 1979.

[Andrianov] And there is another saying too, which says that clean deeds are not done with dirty hands. This saying is applicable in the most direct way to the campaign -- immoral in the highest degree -- which has been conducted in the West in connection with the misfortune that took place at Chernobyl, for the unscrupulousness of the plans of those who organized this propaganda pandemonium is perfectly obvious. What happened in Chernobyl was quite simply seized upon in the West as a convenient excuse for trying to discredit the Soviet Union and its foreign policy; to weaken the influence of the Soviet proposals about ending nuclear tests and eliminating nuclear weapons; and at the same time to ease criticism of U.S. behavior in the international arena and get rid of the wave of condemnation of Washington's militarist course. To put it plainly, Comrade Gorbachev stressed, some Western politicians have been pursuing quite definite objectives: to block the possibility of smoothing out international relations and sow fresh seeds of mistrust and suspicion toward the socialist countries.

[Volskiy] All of this has been clearly displayed at the meeting of heads of states and governments of the seven most developed capitalist countries in Tokyo. Let me remind you that it took place there from 4 to 6 May. The leaders of the seven countries did not even find time to utter one single word about the latest large-scale peace proposals of the Soviet Union. At the Tokyo conference they effectively pretended that these constructive initiatives simply did not exist.

[Andrianov] The seven issued a special statement in connection with the accident at the Chernobyl atomic power station. In it one can clearly see the desire of the U.S. Administration to make use of any event in the world to aggravate the international situation and to whip up anti-Soviet hysteria. One cannot make any other assessment of the intention of the U.S. ruling circles and their most zealous allies to look at what happened at Chernobyl just from one particular angle, from the viewpoint of the possibility it offers for placing additional obstacles in the path of the development and deepening of the dialogue between East and West -- which is already moving forward with difficulty -- and of justifying the nuclear arms race. Judging by reports in the Western press, some participants in the Tokyo conference would now like to dissociate themselves from such an interpretation of the significance of the statement by the seven on Chernobyl.

[Nekrasov] I would like to begin by noting the close link that has been created by, well, the coupling in time of international reaction in the world to the Chernobyl accident with the Tokyo conference.

The Tokyo meeting opened, as you remember, a week after the accident, when the whole world was full of reaction to Chernobyl. You have already given a good account of what this amounted to, Boris Vasilyevich.

In this connection I would just like to stress one side: the world public has closely linked the consequences of this accident with the danger that lies in the nuclear war-heads that have been built up in the world. In fact, this was bound to happen. The organizers of the hysterical anti-Soviet campaign have, in my view, simply shown their own political short-sightedness when they decided that in splashing around their own pathological hatred, as one might call it, for our country, they would thereby undermine the possibility of any positive accords on ending the arms race. This campaign undoubtedly has done harm to the cause of strengthening international confidence, substantial harm. But another process has started in parallel, a more deep-rooted process and one that is more powerful, I would say, as far as its potential is concerned. This is the process of taking on board, of recognizing the dangers of the nuclear age, which

were spoken about in detail at the 27th CPSU Congress: the recognition of these dangers on an emotional level, so to speak. You understand? The level of reason is one thing. At this level it is possible to set against arguments of reason some kind of false statistics, to try to substitute certain concepts for others, in short to confuse and to make fools of people, which is now being done by U.S. official propaganda and by Western propaganda generally, and at times not unsuccessfully.

But the emotional level is quite a different thing. People's feelings of self-preservation, their fear for their children, their terror in the face of an unseen threat that hangs over the world, all these are powerful factors in influencing ways of thinking and they suggest that yes, the accident of the atomic power station is a serious affair, but how many times more serious is the threat to people that is contained in the thousands of nuclear warheads which are primed, as they say? This is something that literally hundreds of millions of people have felt in recent days and this has to be taken into account. In this situation, the leaders of seven countries gathered in Tokyo and, as you said, they uttered not a word about our proposals, about our position which aims to remove this threat that hangs over mankind.

[Andrianov] Those who took part in the Tokyo conference could not, of course, keep silent completely about the main problem of our day, the need to improve the international atmosphere, to end confrontation. The political declaration of the conference mentioned the value of stable and constructive relations between East and West. But this was done in a general, hazy and vague form, and in actual fact, an evident attempt was made to transfer responsibility for the tension that is being maintained, for the blind alley in the Soviet-U.S. talks in Geneva, onto our country. And today, public circles in the West -- as one can judge from reports in the mass media -- are expressing an understandable and legitimate concern over the fact that relying upon Tokyo and making use, so to speak, of the fruits of the anti-Soviet campaign, the diehards in Washington are trying to firmly block any progress in the cause of ending the arms race.

[Nekrasov] I would add that it is not just public circles that are doing this, but the more far-sighted representatives of the West European political world as well. I have in front of me a recent issue of the London TIMES. It writes directly that West European countries which are members of NATO are allegedly feeling, and I quote, ever more serious concern -- that is what the newspaper writes -- that after Chernobyl the United States will toughen its position at the talks and will thus frustrate any possibility of making progress. And so? To this one might reply: And what were you thinking about in Tokyo? Why did you let yourself get under Washington's thumb and agree to the special statement that it imposed about the accident, a statement which was blatantly provocative in its content. But of course, this is not the main point.

The main point is that this concern -- as one can judge from available information -- is to a large extent well founded. What we are talking about is the intention of the U.S. side to make use of the Chernobyl incident to bring the monitoring problem, the verification problem, to the forefront in the talks, and by using it as a shield, to avoid serious discussion on the essentials. In fact, this has already been seen in the negative reply that Washington hastened to give to the new extension of our moratorium on nuclear explosions and to the proposal for a meeting with the U.S. President in order to discuss these issues. This is what they argue: The Soviet Union, supposedly, did not immediately make available complete information about the accident; one cannot, therefore, trust it in connection with any accords. This is actually rubbish. As you know, it was all quite different. This was stressed once again in the address by Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev. But, this same propaganda line is being continued.

[Andrianov] Reports in the Western press indicate that Washington intends to stall the nuclear arms negotiations with the aid of demands to come to an agreement, in the first instance, on some sort of monitoring and verification measures for the observance of future accords, but it refuses to talk about the essence of these accords, insisting on its former unacceptable proposals which aim to achieve the West's military superiority. Monitoring thus changes into some sort of absolute. They want to substitute real steps on lowering the level of military opposition with talk about monitoring. Of course, there is nothing new in this. The West has resorted to these tactics repeatedly in the past as well. What is new are the attempts to account for this position, allegedly, with the lessons of the Chernobyl accident.

[Nekrasov] Well, as we all know, monitoring, in accordance with the fundamental Soviet position, must be a component part of a disarmament agreement; it must further its implementation, and not be the aim per se, and of course, Chernobyl has absolutely nothing to do with this. There is a correlation between the accident at the nuclear power station and the disarmament talks, but it is a different one altogether. That same TIME article that I mentioned gives away its essence: There is a danger -- the newspaper writes it bluntly -- a danger that, in connection with the accident and its consequences, the activities of the antinuclear organizations are livening up. That is the crux of the matter, as they say. They are frightened of the rise in the public struggle against the nuclear danger, which could jumble all the cards of the militarist circles.

One could cite the following curious detail: Currently, in the capitals of Western countries, they are not infrequently recalling events of 2 years ago, when a mass public struggle unfolded against Pershings and cruise missiles on European soil. They are very afraid of another serious burst of public outcry, protest demonstrations, and so on. And so, in the press over the past few days, for example, they are muffling in every possible way the contradictions between the allies, which manifested themselves after the piratical attack on Libya and which came out in Tokyo. But these contradictions are real, and you will not get away from them, and they are going to make themselves known with a growing force.

Summing up what we have been talking about -- the reactions to the Chernobyl accident and the Tokyo conference -- I would recall Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev's words in his speech at the 11th SED Party Congress: The struggle for a peace without soldiers or weapons will be an arduous and lengthy one. The events of the past few days fully confirm this conclusion, and obviously the responsibility that falls to all the peace-loving forces is that much greater. Here the socialist community rises as a reliable barrier on the path of imperialist policy; and do remember that the congresses of a number of communist and workers' parties of fraternal countries held recently have become a weighty confirmation of the fact that our countries continue to be the most consistent fighters for peace and an all-embracing international security.

Over the past few days, the defense organization of the countries in the community -- their military and political alliance embodied in the Warsaw Pact -- was 31 years old. Newspapers in the fraternal countries once again noted during these days that the Warsaw Pact organization not only guarantees peace and security for its participants, but also plays a prominent role in preserving and consolidating peace in Europe and on the whole planet. It was emphasized that the further strengthening of the socialist community's reliable defense shield is essential in the face of NATO's

aggressive policy, in particular that of the United States. To us, on the whole, it is obvious that the most realistic way of surmounting the current dangerous area of confrontation is to intensify the search for political solutions in the widest possible scope. There is quite simply no other way that is more reasonable or that corresponds to the current level of development of our technology and our civilization.

[Andrianov] The events of international life of which we have spoken today again and again confirm that the nuclear era requires new political thinking and new policies. Of course, it was not incidental that Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev, speaking on Soviet television this week, noted that the accident in Chernobyl once more illuminated the abyss that would open up if a nuclear war fell on mankind. After all, the accumulated nuclear arsenals conceal within them thousands upon thousands of disasters far more terrifying than the one at Chernobyl. Realizing this, the Soviet people are strengthening their conviction that the foreign policy course worked out by the 27th CPSU Congress is correct and that our country's proposals on completely eliminating nuclear weapons, ceasing nuclear explosions, and creating an all-embracing system of international security meet the implacably strict demands made by the nuclear era upon the political leaderships of all countries. Under conditions where attention to nuclear issues has become greater, the Soviet Government, having weighed all circumstances connected with the security of its own people and all mankind, has decided to extend its unilateral moratorium on nuclear tests until 6 August this year. Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev has confirmed his proposal to President Reagan to meet without delay in the capital of any European state, or in Hiroshima, and agree on a nuclear test ban. The new manifestation of our country's goodwill has been met with enthusiasm and support in the widest circles of the international community. The USSR's bold initiative begets great hopes, declared David (Cortwright), executive director of the American Committee for a Sane Nuclear Policy. We, he emphasized, call on the President of the United States and the U.S. Congress to follow, finally, the Soviet example and stop nuclear tests.

Here we will end our round table meeting. All its participants are grateful to you for your attention, esteemed comrade listeners. Good-bye. All the best to you.

/7358

CSO: 5200/1366

CHEMICAL/BIOLOGICAL WEAPONS

BELGIAN PRIME MINISTER ON MODERNIZATION OF U.S. CHEMICAL WEAPONS

AU161609 Paris AFP in English 1531 GMT 16 May 86

[Excerpts] Brussels, May 16 (AFP) -- Belgium on Friday agreed to the modernisation of U.S. chemical weapons but stuck to its refusal to allow them to be deployed in Europe in peace time.

Belgium was the only North Atlantic Treaty Organisation (NATO) country to insist on a delay before giving its final position, following a meeting of NATO ambassadors on Thursday which effectively saw agreement for the U.S. plans.

Belgian Prime Minister Wilfried Martens announced Belgian backing for the "force goals" presented by the United States at Thursday's meeting, in an official statement after a cabinet meeting. Mr Martens stressed that in the event of a serious crisis or the threat of war the government would decide for itself on the installation or not of the gases on Belgian soil.

Mr. Martens said he would not oppose transport across Belgian soil of 4,000 tonnes of U.S. chemical agents, currently stockpiled in West Germany, if the United States decided to evacuate them via the Port of Antwerp. The only stocks of chemical weapons left in Europe, at U.S. bases in West Germany, are to be withdrawn by 1992.

/7358

CSO: 5200/2688

RELATED ISSUES

SOVIET ARMY PAPER HITS WEST ON NUCLEAR TESTING, INF, SDI

PM191434 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 17 May 86 Second Edition p 5

[V. Dodonov article under the rubric "Policy of Peace Against Policy of War": "To Withdraw From Circulation"]

[Text] The Soviet Union deems it its paramount duty to do everything possible to improve the situation in the international arena and stop the world from sliding toward a nuclear catastrophe. The nuclear age imperatively demands a new approach toward international relations and the pooling of efforts by states with different social systems for the sake of terminating the fatal arms race and radically improving the world political climate. The Chernobyl accident demonstrated yet again the yawning abyss that would open up should a nuclear war befall mankind. After all, the nuclear arsenals that have been accumulated are fraught with thousands upon thousands of nuclear catastrophes far more terrible than the one at Chernobyl.

A realistic way to solve this problem is offered by the program for the complete elimination of nuclear, chemical, and other mass destruction weapons by the end of this century put forward by the Soviet state. This program stands out as a thoroughly elaborated whole, specific in terms of both its procedure and its implementation schedule. The balance of forces currently prevailing in the world would be maintained at all stages of its implementation, but at an increasingly lower level.

The Soviet concept of nuclear disarmament and universal security corresponds with the specific interests and aspirations of all people on our planet -- to withdraw nuclear weapons from circulation. It has captured the imagination of millions of people in all continents and has received ardent approval and support from Soviet citizens as well as wide circles abroad.

Against this background, the West's attempts to raise doubts about the possibility of accelerating in practice the solution of the immediate problem of our time -- the destruction of nuclear weapons -- appear less and less convincing. For example, Washington administration spokesmen have repeatedly claimed that the United States has apparently set as its ultimate goal "progress toward the total elimination of nuclear weapons." Now that an opportunity does exist to tackle in practice the question of nuclear disarmament, they are "engaging" in reverse gear: The fine words about eliminating these weapons have receded into the background. Something quite different is now "fashionable" for certain Western politicians: Assurances of unconditional commitment to the "star wars" program, claims concerning the "necessity" for the United States to continue testing nuclear devices in order to overcome an alleged "lag" behind the USSR, imaginary "difficulties" in implementing monitoring [kontrol] of the process of nuclear disarmament, and other excuses.

People in the West try to justify on various grounds the "legitimacy" of preserving nuclear weapons for an indefinitely long period. "The complete destruction of nuclear weapons," White House spokesman Speakes prophesied, "demands the simultaneous equalization of imbalances in conventional and other arms, the observance of treaty obligations, and the peaceful settlement of regional conflicts." Statements like this offer vivid proof of Washington's lack of political will and desire to resolve the most vital and acute problem of our time.

In the opinion of the overwhelming majority of specialists and authoritative scientists, the termination of nuclear tests and the conclusion of an all-embracing treaty on the complete prohibition of nuclear tests would constitute a very important practical step aimed at halting the nuclear arms race. This would obstruct the further improvement of existing nuclear weapons and the creation [sozdaniye] of new ones and would help to diminish the nuclear threat.

But the Pentagon, despite the demands of the world public and ignoring calls by statesmen from countries on different continents, continues the implementation of its nuclear program. It is well known that this program is aimed at the creation [sozdaniye] of new types of weapons, including nuclear-pumped x-ray lasers. This type of laser is needed for space-strike weapons.

The complete elimination of Soviet and U.S. medium-range missiles in the European zone on a reciprocal basis would be a very substantial contribution to the improvement of the international situation. With a view to facilitating the achievement of agreement the USSR is prepared to examine the question of medium-range missiles separately, outside any immediate link with the problem of space and strategic weapons. But Washington is unwilling to resolve this question fairly, with due consideration for mutual security. Furthermore, resorting to the hackneyed bogey of "the Soviet military threat," it is continuing to frighten the West Europeans with Soviet missiles. At the same time it is making efforts to build up the impression that the U.S. Pershing-2 and ground-based cruise missiles somehow symbolize the "unbreakable ties" between the interests of U.S. and West European security.

Western propagandists are shouting themselves hoarse in connection with some imaginary "imperfections" in the Soviet plan for the elimination of nuclear weapons and about the alleged defenselessness of the West and of Europe in particular in the face of "superior" Soviet nonnuclear forces, which would allegedly ensue from such a liquidation. These pseudo-arguments were totally demolished by the new Soviet initiatives outlined by the general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee at the 11th SED Congress in Berlin and in his 14 May speech on Soviet television.

The Soviet Government, having weighed all the factors affecting the security of its own people and all of mankind, decided to extend its moratorium on nuclear tests until 6 August. "We again call on the United States," M.S. Gorbachev stressed, "to weigh with the utmost responsibility the danger hanging over mankind and to heed the world community's opinion. Let those who head the United States demonstrate by deeds their concern for people's life and health." There was a simultaneous confirmation of the proposal to hold an urgent meeting with President Reagan in the capital of any European state or, say, Hiroshima, and to reach agreement on a nuclear test ban.

The most zealous champions of nuclear missiles and bombs are diligently trying to prove that any program for nuclear disarmament is not feasible in practice since, according to

their claims, it is impossible to establish that all nuclear systems have been destroyed. Moreover, they say, technical knowledge in the nuclear sphere will be preserved. "The technology for the creation [sozdaniye] of nuclear weapons has been in existence for 40 years now, and there is no way to wipe this knowledge from mankind's memory. A nuclear weapons ban will not and cannot take place. We must learn to coexist with nuclear weapons," THE WASHINGTON TIMES suggests.

The Western mass news media draw a sinister conclusion. There are, it appears, some "figures" who consider that the fear of a nuclear war offers the best guarantee for preventing world war III. By the looks of it, people in NATO capitals have gotten used to nuclear weapons and link certain plans in the international arena with them. Confirmation of this is provided by M. Thatcher's statement in an interview with THE TIMES: "I cannot imagine the world without nuclear weapons." The people demand real progress in the cause of reducing nuclear arsenals. The USSR is prepared for this. And the Western politicians, whether they want to or not, will also have to answer the question: Are they altogether prepared to say farewell to nuclear, as well as chemical and other types of mass destruction weapons? Are they prepared for specific steps, practical actions, and real agreements to curb the arms race?

/7358

CSO: 5200/1365

RELATED ISSUES

PRAVDA ARTICLE ON ARMS VERIFICATION ISSUE

LD131421 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 13 May 86 First Edition p 4

[Yu. Tomilin article: "Disarmament and Monitoring"]

[Text] The struggle against the nuclear danger and the arms race for the preservation and strengthening of universal peace is a key avenue in the Soviet Union's activity in the international arena. The Soviet foreign policy initiatives put forward on 15 January enjoy wide support in the world. That is why the opponents of disarmament and those who pursue a policy of confrontation and strong-arm pressure with regard to other countries are having to resort to various subterfuges in order to conceal their reluctance to accept arms limitation measures, and ultimately to prevent the adoption of such measures.

It is usually the so-called problem of monitoring [kontrol] that is used for this purpose. In essence the postwar history of examination of questions of arms limitation and disarmament involves disputes over this problem. Yet there need be no such disputes, were they not created artificially by the opponents of disarmament.

In those individual cases where situations have arisen in which the United States and other Western powers have accepted certain arms limitation measures, questions of monitoring have also been resolved. However, as soon as the international situation has deteriorated through the fault of imperialist circles and the opportunities to achieve accords with regard to arms limitation have correspondingly decreased, the so-called difficulties of monitoring have also immediately increased. Depending on the situation, the supporters of the arms race use various methods to create such difficulties.

They often try to substitute the monitoring of armaments for the monitoring of disarmament. In this respect the American proposals known in their day as the "Baruch plan," the "open skies plan," and a number of others are highly typical. These plans, without proposing any arms limitation measures, put forward demands, basically, for total monitoring — and not only of arms, but also of a significant proportion of peaceful activity.

Another method is this. They claim that the Soviet Union, by virtue of the very nature of its social system, can supposedly covertly violate arms limitation and disarmament agreements, and that therefore it is better not to conclude any such agreements with it. What kind of a nature is this, that does not permit monitoring? The authors of this "argument" claim, it appears, that Soviet society is "closed." It is another matter in

the United States, Britain, and the other Western countries, with their "open society." They supposedly publish the relevant data and generally wear their hearts on their sleeves.

This assertion is false from start to finish. No country would reveal its secrets. What they call the Western countries' "openness" is an illusion, a myth. For instance, everyone who has studied the so-called "hearings" of U.S. congressional committees and subcommittees knows that the most important part of their materials are not published, while many "hearings" take place entirely behind closed doors. The same happens in other Western countries. Every sovereign state decides for itself what data it will publish in what circumstances, and what it will not publish. As for the Soviet Union, having once concluded an agreement it always observes it strictly and makes available those data that the terms of the agreement require.

Western, especially American, diplomacy, in order to drag out talks or prevent them from starting, also resorts to the following method: It is stated that before starting the talks it is necessary to resolve technical questions of monitoring and determine the available -- again, technical -- potential for verification [proverka] of the measure which is to be discussed. Then these technical aspects become well and truly bogged down in endless debates on individual questions of little significance.

Finally, one more method is used. It is announced that a particular arms limitation measure cannot be implemented, since it is supposedly impossible to monitor its observance. Precisely this method has been used by the United States for a long time to block, for instance, the attainment of an accord on banning all nuclear weapon tests.

Back in 1958, a conference of experts from eight countries, including the USSR and the United States, came to the conclusion that such a ban is susceptible to reliable monitoring. Despite this conclusion, official representatives of Western states at the talks started after the experts' conference began to make far-fetched demands in the monitoring sphere.

A few years passed, and a whole series of American ambassadors, successive heads of the U.S. delegation to those talks, admitted that the problem had been used artificially by the American side to prevent the attainment of agreement. The Soviet side only had to show flexibility and go half-way to meet its Western partners' proposals, and they promptly discovered "new data" and the United States went back on its own proposals. Thus J. Wadsworth, who was head of the American delegation at the talks, testified that the Soviet side conducted the talks "with the serious intention of achieving agreement," and that the United States was at fault that the agreement was not concluded.

We could also take a more recent example -- The trilateral (USSR, United States, Britain) talks on the same issue held in 1977-1980. As the talks progressed, the United States made increasingly tough demands in the monitoring sphere. After dragging out the talks in this way, the United States then simply broke them off.

The Soviet Union believed and continues to believe that the existing national technical means of verification are sufficient for monitoring that no nuclear tests are held. However, in order to eliminate the so-called difficulties in resolving this issue, it has declared its readiness to accept the strictest verification measures, including on-site inspection [inspektsiya]. The USSR agrees, in particular, with the proposal of the leaders of the six states -- Argentina, Greece, India, Mexico, Tanzania, and Sweden -- that they give assistance in the verification of the bilateral cessation of nuclear tests by the Soviet Union and the United States, including on-site inspections.

The United States was forced to show its hand, admitting that it is not a question of monitoring, but of the fact that it needs tests in order to improve its nuclear weapons and test [proverka] the reliability of stockpiles. But this, they say, applies to an all-embracing ban, while the United States could accept a so-called "threshold" ban, though here again monitoring difficulties get in the way.

It is worth dwelling in a little more detail on this "threshold" ban. Indeed, such a ban, that is, a ban on explosions above a specified yield threshold, is more difficult to monitor than the complete cessation of nuclear tests. Nonetheless, even this is possible. In 1974, the Soviet Union and the United States signed the Treaty on the Limitation of Underground Nuclear Weapons Tests under which it is forbidden to carry out any underground tests of nuclear weapons with a yield of more than 150 kilotons. In 1976, this document was supplemented by the signing of the Treaty on Underground Nuclear Explosions for Peaceful Purposes, which was designed to regulate the holding of such explosions in the conditions of a "threshold" nuclear weapon test ban. For both treaties a detailed system was elaborated for the verification of their observance, including the exchange of relevant data and on-site verification with regard to peaceful nuclear explosions. The United States subsequently announced its refusal to ratify them, saying that the measures for monitoring the observance of the agreements were not adequate.

The United States put forward a proposal for Soviet specialists to come to their testing ground in Nevada to observe a test nuclear weapon explosion. American propaganda made a great fuss about this invitation. But to this day nobody in the United States can explain the point of it. Why should Soviet specialists observe an American nuclear test? In order to sanction it with their presence? If it is a question of ensuring monitoring of the observance of the 1974 and 1976 "threshold" treaties, the treaties make provision for a reliable verification system. In order to convince yourself of this it is only necessary to bring these treaties into operation. In other words, it is necessary to exchange data and fulfill the other conditions, and that includes carrying out calibration explosions, for which the 1974 treaty provides, and resorting to the on-site verification procedures for which the 1976 treaty provides.

In a similar way, Washington is artificially and deliberately creating "monitoring difficulties" in the sphere of banning chemical weapons.

For a number of years the United States opposed starting talks on a chemical weapons ban, trying to prove that it is supposedly impossible to monitor a ban on these weapons. Later, under the influence of a wide range of states and of world public opinion, the United States entered into, first, bilateral and then multilateral talks on the conclusion of a convention on the banning and destruction of chemical weapons. Although it had thereby acknowledged the possibility of monitoring, it tried nonetheless to complicate the course of the talks by putting forward demands it knew to be unacceptable to many other countries. Thus there emerged the American proposal that state enterprises, in the main, should be subject to the toughest control -- so-called special inspections to be carried out on request. Obviously, if this proposal was accepted, the countries where the state sector of the economy prevails, first and foremost the socialist countries, would be in a completely unequal position compared with the states where the private capital sector prevails, first and foremost the United States. Having encountered sharp criticism of this absurd proposal, the United States was forced to withdraw it in April of this year.

The Soviet Union advocates the quickest banning and destruction of chemical weapons under the strictest monitoring, including international on-site verification. New confirmation of the USSR's constructive stance is provided by the proposals announced by M.S. Gorbachev in his speech at the 11th SED Congress on 16 April.

Putting forward, in the same speech, a new initiative on a considerable reduction of conventional arms and armed forces in Europe, the Soviet leader stressed the need for reliable monitoring at all stages of this process. It could be a question both of national technical means and of international forms of verification, including on-site inspection where necessary.

The Soviet Union proposed a similar approach with regard to the monitoring of the program it put forward on 15 January for the total elimination of nuclear weapons throughout the world by the year 2000. The monitoring of the arms being destroyed and limited would be carried out both by national means and through on-site inspections. The USSR is prepared to reach agreement on any other additional monitoring measures.

Thus in all areas of arms limitation the Soviet Union advocates effective monitoring that would ensure complete confidence in the observance of accords. The Soviet Union's readiness to accept the strictest international forms of verification of the observance of agreed disarmament measures robs the disarmament opponents of the means of disguising their negative approach.

The essence of the Soviet position is this: Disarmament without monitoring is impossible, but monitoring without disarmament is pointless. This position is as precise as it is fair and honest.

Soviet proposals on arms limitation and disarmament always link monitoring in the closest possible way with the process of limiting and eliminating arms, and never regard it as some kind of self-sufficient measure. Therefore, monitoring must be an integral part of disarmament agreements, playing the part of a means of promoting the fulfillment of the agreement.

There is no weapon the Soviet Union would not be prepared to limit or ban on a mutual basis with effective monitoring. This is solemnly declared in the CPSU Program, the new edition of which was adopted by the 27th CPSU Congress.

/7358

CSO: 5200/1365

RELATED ISSUES

SOVIET JOURNAL ON ARMS POLICY IN THE PARTY PROGRAM

Moscow MIROVAYA EKONOMIKA I MEZHDUNARODNYYE OTNOSHENIYA in Russian No 2, Feb 86 (signed to press 14 Jan 86) pp 16-27

["Article by A. Osipov: "Program of Peace and Social Progress." For the full text of this article see the USSR REPORT: WORLD ECONOMY AND INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS No 2, February 1986, JPRS-UWE-86-006, 21 April 1986, pp 19-32]

[Excerpts] The unity of the domestic and international tasks being tackled by our party is inseparable and the interconnection of its creative, future-oriented economic and social policy with strategy in the international arena aimed at the consolidation of peace is indissoluble. The external conditions of the growth of the society of developed socialism built in the USSR into the highest phase of communism cannot be divorced from internal conditions. Their dialectical unity is comprehensively revealed in the documents being submitted for examination by the 27th CPSU Congress, primarily in the draft new version of the third party program.

I

The draft new version of the CPSU Program contains an in-depth and comprehensive analysis of the picture of the modern world and the class struggle in the international arena; it reveals the nature, alignment and mutual relations of the main opposed social and political forces. With regard for the appreciable changes which have occurred in the world in the last quarter century the draft has been enriched by a number of new fundamentally important conclusions, while individual theoretical propositions have been specified compared with the current program.

This applies primarily to the characterization of the main content of the modern era and the main driving forces of social development; the historic achievements and advantages of socialism as a level of man's progress superior to capitalism; the socialist community, in which relations of socialist internationalism are embodied to the fullest extent; the anti-imperialist struggle of the countries which have thrown off the imperialist yoke for the consolidation of their independence and social progress; the mass democratic movements in the nonsocialist world; the three leading centers of interimperialist rivalry; and the exploiter world of capitalism, which is still strong and dangerous, but which has already passed its zenith, and its deepening general crisis and the reactionary, antihumane essence of the policy and ideology of imperialism.

It is from imperialism, primarily American, that the threat of war emanates. The most acute problem now confronting mankind, the draft new version of the party program emphasizes, is that of war and peace.

Militarism in all its forms and manifestations and the arms race represent senseless waste. They are exposed as mercilessly as can be by the new version of the party program. The gigantic military spending is enriching the

monopolies and the ruling elite to an unprecedented extent and lying as a heavy burden on the working people. Imperialism is putting the achievements of the human genius at the service of the creation of weapons of monstrous destructive power. The force of class egotism is turning the creations of man's mind and hands against himself. Such is the glaring, intolerable contradiction with which mankind has reached the threshold of the 21st century. The ominous alliance of the merchants of death, the top brass, the state bureaucracy and the ideological machinery of imperialism and militarized science, which have merged into the military-industrial complex—this is the support of extreme reaction, a constant source of military danger and confirmation of the political and socio-moral bankruptcy of the capitalist system.

II

The foreign policy aims of the CPSU Central Committee April (1985) Plenum are a concrete expression of a Leninist approach to an evaluation of the current international situation. The plenum emphasized the need for a stimulation in every possible way of the USSR's peace-loving policy along the broadest front of international relations. Mankind has approached the point where inaction or a delay in actions are criminal since it is a question of the preservation of civilization and life itself and when particularly responsible decisions are required. The Central Committee Plenum appealed for everything necessary to be done to ensure that the forces of militarism and aggression not prevail and that the vicious circle of the arms race be broken immediately and that the disarmament process be started and advocated the development of equal, correct and civilized relations between states and the expansion and deepening of mutually profitable international economic relations.

The modern world is a multi-aspectual sum total of almost 200 sovereign countries, and each has its own traditions and interests and its aspirations and policies. The desire of each people to realize their sovereign rights in the political, economic and social spheres is natural. But simultaneously there is a growth of states' interdependence and interconnection. This is the objective result of the internationalization of all social and economic life and at the same time an important factor of international stability. The interdependence of states and peoples could be a powerful stimulus to a strengthening of stable, normal relations between them.

But a new, constructive policy is required, new approaches to international relations are needed and new thinking based on a recognition of the realities of the present-day world is essential for this. The CPSU proceeds from the fact that, given the tremendous diversity of social and political forces operating in the world arena, only a stable and dependable foreign policy befits states and parties conscious of their responsibility for the fate of peace. In this sense Soviet policy, which is based on Lenin's principle of the peaceful coexistence of states of the two opposite social systems, is entirely predictable and contains no uncertainties. The draft new version of the party program provides sound reference points for the formulation of the correct foreign policy course.

The CPSU declares the aims of its international policy openly and for all to hear: it will continue to do everything in its power for the preservation of the peaceful conditions of Soviet people's creative labor, an improvement in international relations and a suspension of the arms race which has engulfed the world in order to ward off the threat of nuclear war looming over the peoples and the other dangers lying in wait for mankind on the threshold of the third millennium.

III

The Soviet Union is also making efforts to improve relations with the capitalist states. It is building its relations with them on the high-minded basis of the principle of the peaceful coexistence of states with different social systems. The draft new version of the party program reveals this principle thoroughly and comprehensively. It signifies not simply an absence of wars.

It is an international order wherein not military force but good-neighborliness and cooperation predominate and a broad exchange of the achievements of S&T and cultural values to the benefit of all peoples takes place. Getting rid of the squandering of tremendous resources on military needs would make it possible to channel the fruits of labor solely for purposes of creation. Countries which have embarked on the path of independent development would be protected against outside encroachments, which would facilitate their movement along the path of national upturn. Favorable opportunities would also be created for the solution by the collective efforts of all states of the global problems of mankind. Peaceful coexistence corresponds to the interests of all countries and all peoples.

The policy of peaceful coexistence as the CPSU understands it presupposes: the renunciation of war and the use or threat of force as a means of solving contentious questions and their solution by way of negotiation; noninterference in internal affairs and consideration of one another's legitimate interests; the right of the peoples to independently dispose of their fate; strict respect for states' sovereignty and territorial integrity and the inviolability of their borders; cooperation based on complete equality and mutual benefit; and the good-neighborly fulfillment of commitments ensuing from the generally recognized principles and rules of international law and international treaties.

In a world filled with acute contradictions and in the nuclear age there is no nor can there be any sensible alternative in the face of the catastrophe which is threatened to the peaceful coexistence of states with different social systems. The sole acceptable solution today is the establishment of the active cooperation of all states--large and small--in the interests of a common peaceful future and the creation, use and development of international mechanisms and institutions which would make it possible to find the optimum correlations of national, state interests and general interests. Only by joint efforts is it possible to emerge from the present period of dangerous tension. This indisputable truth determines and will continue to determine the Soviet Union's relations with all countries.

The reality of the present-day world is such that particular responsibility for the nature of world development and its course and consequences and the preservation of peace has been entrusted by history primarily to two states by virtue of their military, economic and S&T potential and international authority, to two nuclear powers--the USSR and the United States. The draft new version of the party program observes that the CPSU advocates normal, stable relations between the two countries presupposing noninterference in internal affairs, respect for one another's legitimate interests, recognition and realization in practice of the principle of equality and equal security, nondetriment to the interests of third countries and the establishment on this basis of as much mutual trust as possible. There are no contradictions fatally condemning the USSR and the United States to confrontation, even less, to war, on the contrary, objective prerequisites exist for the establishment of fruitful, mutually profitable Soviet-American cooperation.

It is necessary for this that both sides master the very difficult art of living in peace with one another and negotiating on an equal and mutually profitable basis, without which solving serious problems is impossible.

At the present pivotal stage of international relations, under conditions where mankind is faced with a choice between survival and the threat of annihilation, a major political event of international life was the 19-21 November 1985 meeting between M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, and U.S. President R. Reagan. Evaluating the significance of the Geneva meeting in the context of the current situation and with regard for the experience of the past and prospects for the future, the USSR Supreme Soviet observed in its decree that its results afford opportunities for a transition from the present stage of dangerous confrontation to a constructive quest for ways of normalizing Soviet-American relations and improving the international situation as a whole. They are capable of exerting a positive influence on a change in the political and psychological climate in contemporary international relations and an improvement therein and of reducing the threat of the outbreak of nuclear war.

The agreement reached in Geneva on the continuation of meetings between the leaders of the two powers and the stimulation of dialogue at other levels and exchanges and contacts in bilateral relations are intended to perform an appreciable role here. As the CPSU Central Committee Politburo pointed out, the security sphere, the nucleus of which is the problem of preventing the

militarization of space and reducing nuclear arms in their organic connection, will remain determining in Soviet-American relations. A major result of the meeting was the mutual understanding arrived at between the leaders of the two powers and expressed in the joint Soviet-American statement that nuclear war must never be unleashed and that it could have no winners. There is also fundamental significance in the two sides' recognition of the importance of preventing any war between them--nuclear or conventional--and of the proposition that they will not strive to achieve military superiority.

Removal of the nuclear threat on the basis of prevention of the escape of the arms race into space and the winding down thereof on Earth is a cardinal task. Its accomplishment demands a responsible approach and specific practical action from both sides and their readiness to act in accordance with the statement adopted in Geneva and also the contribution of all other states and peace-loving social-political forces. For its part, the Soviet Union will do everything necessary to accomplish this task and will continue to firmly and purposefully pursue a high-minded policy of a suspension of the arms race and disarmament and of peace and the security of the peoples. This policy has Soviet people's warm support, is unanimously approved by our friends and allies, is meeting with broad understanding of responsible statesmen and politicians and is perceived with hope by the peoples.

The Geneva meeting could be the point of departure for a change for the better in Soviet-American relations and in the world in general. "...We have embarked upon an exceptionally crucial period, when it is essential to materialize words, intentions and political statements in actual decisions and deeds," M.S. Gorbachev has declared. It is a question of "decisions and deeds which would contribute to a smoothing out of Soviet-American relations and a general improvement in the world's political weather." And trade and economic and S&T ties as serious stabilizers of the relations cannot be disregarded here. For bilateral relations to be truly strong, stable and capable of ensuring reliable peace developed business ties must be made the foundation thereof.

IV

The Lenin Party Program is geared by its every line to the prevention of war and the establishment of peace on Earth. There is no higher and more crucial mission than this. All the peoples of our planet have a common enemy--the threat of nuclear annihilation--and one most important task--removing this threat. Never before was the danger looming over mankind so menacing, but never before were the possibilities of the preservation and consolidation of peace so practicable. The draft new version of the program signposts the paths aimed at the achievement of this goal and contains specific proposals and outlines the practical steps which have to be taken in the name of ensuring that the history of civilization not come to a thermonuclear end. Having united their efforts, the peoples can and must ward off the military danger. The CPSU proceeds from the fact that however great the threat to peace created by the policy of aggressive imperialist circles, world war is not a fatal inevitability. Preventing it is the historic calling of socialism and all progressive, peace-loving forces of our planet.

Peace is simultaneously both the purpose and a condition of communist building. The purpose of communism is not only securing the material and spiritual burgeoning of society but also establishing lasting peace in the world. At the same time, however, peace is an essential condition for accomplishing the far-reaching tasks of transition to the highest phase of the communist formation. The policy of peace is just as inseparable from socialism as the policy of aggression and war is inseparable from imperialism. In emphatically championing peace, struggling against the threat of nuclear catastrophe and actively pursuing a policy of the peaceful coexistence of the two systems and their competition and international cooperation the Soviet Union is the spokesman for the fundamental vital interests of all mankind and its present and future generations. It is thereby defending the right of all terrestrials to life--man's natural and primary right.

Peaceful aspirations imbue the CPSU's plans for the future. The creative nature of its concerns is strikingly demonstrated by the planned directions of the country's economic and social development in the 12th Five-Year Plan and right up to the year 2000. The Soviet Union considers the accomplishment of the tasks that have been advanced its international duty. It will enable our country to enter the third millennium as an even mightier power which by its peaceful achievements will exert an ever increasing progressive influence on the course of world development. This will serve to extend socialist economic integration and further confirm the principle of the peaceful coexistence of states with different social systems and will be a substantial contribution to the cause of peace in the world.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatelstvo TsK KPSS "Pravda". "Mirovaya ekonomika i mezhdunarodnyye otnosheniya". 1986

/7358

CSO: 5200/1365

RELATED ISSUES

USSR: IMPORTANCE, NATURE OF STRATEGIC PARITY

AU250545 Moscow MIROVAYA EKONOMIKA I MEZHDURNARODNYE OTNOSHENIYA in Russian
No 3 Mar 1986 (signed to press 12 Feb 86) pp 28-29

[Article by O. Bykov: "General Security Is An Imperative Of the Times"]

[Text] The international relations of our time are diverse, complex, and contradictory. This is a reflection of the realities of contemporary world development. The foreign policy courses of the widest range of states belonging to different social systems conflict and interact in the international arena. Bilateral relations are interwoven with multilateral ones. Rivalry, competition, and cooperation are characteristic of the political, economic, and other spheres. But for all the acuteness of international life, a problem in which the vital interests of all states are focused has advanced into the foreground, namely, the problem of international security and, in essence, the question of mankind's survival in the nuclear age.

In recent years, the scale and intensity of military confrontation has risen sharply by the fault of the aggressive forces of militarism, primarily U.S. militarism. The confrontation has led to critical tension and to the undermining of mutual confidence. The accelerating rates of the arms race have entered a stage fraught with the irreversable destabilization of the strategic situation, particularly if weapons are placed in space. Arms limitation agreements have been blocked. The old hotbeds of explosive conflicts continue to exist and new ones have appeared in various regions of the globe.

The intensification of the threat of war has made it an absolute priority of politics to ensure international security. What is involved is no longer simply the pressing need for individual measures to restrain the dangerous course of events, but broad countermeasures aimed at a radical change for an improvement in the entire world situation. The imperative of the times is now a qualitative shift in international affairs toward ensuring a truly all-embracing, genuinely general security which requires the combined efforts of all states and people for the sake of preventing the death of world civilization and even of life itself on our planet.

The growing interdependence of peoples' interests in various spheres of constructive activity and also stable and peaceful relations between all states are an indispensable condition for the maximum utilization of the boundless

potential for developing mutually advantageous international cooperation for the good of the people. This potential is opened up by the scientific-technological revolution, from the widening of trade-economic, scientific-technological, cultural, and other ties to the joint solution of urgent global problems.

Reliable security for all is both possible and realistic, because the intensification of the threat of war is overshadowed by the rise in the interdependence of the interests of survival and cooperation. It is necessary to have a profound awareness of the realities of the nuclear and space age and a readiness to act in a constructive spirit for the sake of the preservation of peace and the progressive development of mankind.

I

One of the most difficult things in politics is to escape from the vicious circle of "action and counteraction." In order to overcome the inertia of confrontation and to cut through the tight knot which it has tied, it is necessary to display the highest degree of state wisdom and a capability for unorthodox interpretation of security problems.

It is also important to hold fast to a course of positive new impulses in the development of the international situation. The responsibility for the fate of peace requires us to rise above discord and calls for joint efforts to resolve the primary task for all people of our time--the elimination of the danger of a nuclear war.

It was to adopt precisely this approach to the burning issue of international security that the Soviet leadership was empowered by the April (1985) CPSU Central Committee Plenum, which stressed the need for the activation of everything possible in the USSR's peace-loving policy on the broadest front of international relations. The plenum called for every effort to be made in order that the forces of militarism and aggression not prevail; pointed out the urgency of halting the arms race and moving toward real disarmament; and came out in favor of developing smooth, correct, and civilized relations between states and of expanding and deepening mutually advantageous economic ties. The foreign policy aims of the April Plenum were embodied in the Soviet Union's large-scale concrete peace initiatives, which exerted a favorable influence on the political climate in the world and largely prepared the ground for a most important event--the Soviet-American summit meeting in Geneva.

Washington's approach was different. From the beginning of the eighties, the U.S. Administration adopted a course of confrontation, of upsetting strategic parity, and of achieving military superiority over the Soviet Union and a dominant position in the world. However, this bellicose course inevitably came into conflict with the realities of the contemporary world. Pressure met with a firm rebuff from the Soviet Union and the other countries of the socialist community. The rejection of Washington's policy increased all over the world, including among its allies. The struggle around foreign policy questions intensified within U.S. ruling circles themselves.

As a result, a certain reassessment of a number of obsolete postulates of U.S. policy began--although in an inconsistent and contradictory way--and some changes began to show. In Washington, certain signs of comprehension of the need for interaction by the sides appeared, a need conditioned by the objective community of interests in the face of the threat of mutual destruction.

The meeting between M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, and U.S. President Reagan in Geneva from 19 to 21 November 1985 was necessary, timely, and useful. After long years of dangerous confrontation, hope for a turn for the better in the world situation appeared and the way opened to the normalization of Soviet-American relations and for a constructive search for mutually acceptable solutions to controversial international questions.

The very fact that there was a meeting between the supreme leaders of two states possessing the largest military, economic, and scientific-technological potential as well as great political weight had a stabilizing effect on the state of affairs in the world. But the results of the Geneva meeting have a much broader, more principled significance with regard to strengthening international security. The mutual understanding on the cardinal issues of world politics that was achieved at the summit level and fixed in the joint statement laid the foundations for a subsequent Soviet-American dialogue. The leaders of both states declared that nuclear war must never be unleashed and that there can be no victor in such a war. They stressed the importance of preventing any war between the USSR and the United States, nuclear or conventional, and assumed the obligation not to strive for military superiority. The most important starting points have thus been determined for the joint development of concrete accords in the sphere of international security.

The significance of the central point of agreement that became clear in Geneva is difficult to overestimate: It has been determined at the most authoritative level that the historical argument between states with different social systems cannot be solved by military means.

Mutual understanding of the fundamental fact of our time was reached, the fact that the use of weapons of monstrous destructive power cannot serve any rational political goals. The sides agreed that there are no contradictions that would fatally doom the USSR and the United States to confrontation or war.

It would, of course, be unjustified to draw a conclusion from this about the possibility of placing Soviet-American relations in some peaceful, idyllic state. The differences of opinion between the Soviet Union and the United States cannot disappear. It is only important that they remain within the framework of peaceful coexistence and do not create the danger of a head-on conflict, with all its catastrophic consequences for both states and all mankind.

Speaking at the press conference in Geneva after ending his talks with U.S. President R. Reagan, M.S. Gorbachev noted that: "Characteristic of the

present international situation is a very important feature that both we and the United States must take into account in our foreign policy. This is what I have in mind. In the present conditions what is involved is no longer just the opposition of two social systems, but also the choice between survival or mutual destruction."

The harsh alternative has been put forth by the entire course of world development, which also dictates the only sensible choice--that in favor of survival. This is reflected in the main result of the Geneva meeting. For all the divergencies in their policies, the sides found common ground in their approach to the central problem--that of war and peace--and this can and must serve as the starting point for improving Soviet-American relations and the entire world situation.

It is quite clear that this alone is insufficient, not only because the understanding reached in Geneva still has to be embodied in concrete accords, but also because, although the problem of ensuring general security forms the heart of Soviet-American relations, it is far from confined to these two states. In contemporary conditions its solution requires efforts by many states. It is from this that the Soviet Union and other socialist states proceed in actively participating in the process of strengthening general security on a multilateral basis and in interacting with the most diverse capitalist and developing states.

Nonetheless, the main link in the global security structure continues to be the mutual security of the USSR and the United States. This is natural. The mutual relations of the Soviet Union and the United States continue to occupy a special place in the system of contemporary international relations. On their state of relations largely depend the correlation of stabilizing and destabilizing tendencies in the world situation, primarily in the strategic respect, and in the final analysis the very possibility of preventing nuclear war. The strategic parity that has formed between the USSR and the United States is the central component in the balance of forces between the Warsaw Pact and the North Atlantic alliance and is its main support.

Military-strategic balance is a powerful factor of general security that objectively contributes to maintaining international stability. Indeed, it is difficult to imagine that the relaxation of international tension and the conclusion of arms limitation agreements would have become possible at one time without such a balance. And how much is the risk of the outbreak of war as a result of the confrontation unleashed by militarist circles for that purpose, a risk that was enormous in any case would have grown had it not been for the restraining framework of strategic parity and general equality of each countries' Armed Forces!

For all the differences in the components of the sides' strategic potential, the balance that has been established between them is fairly stable. It is conditioned by the presence on both sides of the economic and scientific-technical resources necessary to prevent one of them from achieving superiority over the other. No one can gain the upper hand in military competition. It is necessary to become accustomed to approximate equality of forces as a

natural state. It stands to reason that aggressive imperialist circles do not at all want to become reconciled to the reality of military-strategic parity and are ready to continue the arms race infinitely with the goal of acquiring a decisive superiority for the United States and NATO. These aspirations are hopeless, but they are dangerous in that they carry an implicit threat that strategic stability will be shaken and international security undermined.

At the same time, equality of forces makes for a predisposition for adventurist, militarist schemes in the policy and strategy of bourgeois states, primarily the United States, to be driven back by sober, realistic calculations, or at least by elementary considerations of self-preservation. Life makes it necessary to assess the interests of one's own security in a new way, not to place them in opposition to the interests of other's security but, on the contrary, to place them in the context of general security. The reorientation of political thinking and strategic planning in the West to new ways is proceeding with difficulty. The stereotypes of the past that have been taken root hinder this. But it is necessary to reorient oneself if one is thinking seriously about security and not giving oneself up to unrealistic thoughts of hegemony.

The mutual obligation of the Soviet Union and the United States not to strive for military superiority strengthens their security in equal measure. On the other hand, attempts to alter the strategic balance in one's favour would stimulate further military rivalry, and in the final analysis both sides would end up with less security. The Soviet leadership is deeply convinced that less security for the United States compared with the Soviet Union--even if this were feasible in practice--would be disadvantageous to the Soviet side, as it would lead to distrust and give rise to instability.

Mechanistic "counterweight" schemes are inapplicable to the sphere of international security. In our time the concept of this sphere must be constructed not on the opposition of some states to others, but rather on the objective coincidence of their interests in preventing a general catastrophe--nuclear war. In this sense, the more reliable the mutual security of the USSR and the United States--naturally, without harming the interests of third countries--the higher the level of global international security. In turn, a great degree of security in the relations of third countries or in individual regions is to the good of both Soviet-American relations and international relations as a whole. Thus, as a result of the positive interaction of many states, a new type of international security is appearing and developing that is engendered by the demands of the preservation and the progress of world civilization.

Equality in the sphere of security, as in the strategic sphere, is far from being a simple arithmetical equation. It is not only characterized by the quantity and quality of weapons or even by more general indices of military might; it also has very important nonmilitary parameters--socioeconomic, scientific-technical, geographic, diplomatic, psychological, and others. Moreover, nonmilitary aspects acquire increasing importance in conditions of a stable balance. Parity contributes to turning security from a primarily

military category into a primarily political one. Equality and reciprocity move the problem of security from a narrow confining framework into a broad field of political cooperation between states in the interests of a fundamental improvement in the world situation.

Of course, the balance of military forces cannot be accepted as an ideal condition for the development of international relations, particularly if it is maintained at the present high level.

But it is not the final result, merely the necessary starting point for advancing toward mutual security on the broadest front.

It is precisely toward this end that the decisions of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and the Soviet Government on a number of large, new USSR foreign policy actions of a principled nature are directed. In his statement of 15 January 1986, M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, stressed that these decisions are expected to greatly promote an improvement of the international situation; to overcome the negative confrontational trends that have grown in recent years; and to clear the way toward curtailing the arms race on earth, preventing it in space, generally reducing the danger of war, and building confidence as an inseparable component in the relations between states.

II

The general trend toward strengthening international security is beginning to gather force, but it is being stubbornly resisted by militarist circles, which are continuing to rely on force in their policy and are whipping up the arms race.

It is necessary for there to be joint understanding of the fact that a considerably smaller amount of weapons than now possessed by the sides is adequate for purely defensive goals. A radical reduction in the arms level on the basis of equality and reciprocity will not only not weaken, but, on the contrary, will substantially strengthen the security of both the USSR and the United States, will stabilize the world strategic situation, and will clear the way toward disarmament--the pivot of international security.

Of principled importance was the accord reached by the foreign ministers of the Soviet Union and the United States in Geneva in January 1985. This accord dealt with negotiations that cover the entire complex of space-based and nuclear weapons and have as their goal the prevention of the arms race in space and limiting on earth.

Prior to the Soviet-American summit meeting, the USSR advanced a series of proposals designed to shift the negotiations on nuclear and space weapons that were at a standstill. Carefully developed in strict accordance with the principle of equality and equal security, they provided for the achievement of an accord between the USSR and the United States on a total mutual ban on space-based weapons and on a truly radical 50 percent cut in nuclear weapons that reach each other's territory. The USSR also proposed that

medium-range nuclear weapons in Europe be cut. This was to be done through the conclusion of an intermediate agreement separately, not in direct connection with the problem of space-based and strategic weapons.

In the interests of creating a favorable atmosphere for negotiations, the Soviet Union undertook a number of important steps: It unilaterally halted all nuclear tests, expressing a readiness to rapidly renew negotiations on a total nuclear test ban; it announced a moratorium on the siting of its medium-range missiles in the European zone and took out of combat readiness that quantity that had been deployed [razvernuty] in response to the installation [ustanovka] of U.S. medium-range weapons in Western Europe; it confirmed its unilateral moratorium on the testing of anti-satellite weapons; it proposed that, on condition that the arms race be prevented in space, widescale international cooperation be developed in researching and utilizing space for peaceful purposes.

A number of Soviet initiatives aimed at arms limitation and reduction did not go unanswered. It is true that many points in the counterproposals advanced by the United States essentially repeated everything that for a number of years had created an obstacle in the path of agreement.

First and foremost, they continue to contain unacceptable provisions that ignore the differences in structure of the opposing forces and which are aimed at a substantial cutback in the main component of Soviet strategic power--ICBM's--with a smaller reduction in the basic strike weapons of the U.S. strike potential--submarine-launched ballistic missiles and heavy bombers, including those with cruise missiles on board.

At the same time, the U.S. position on certain issues were contiguous to the Soviet ones; to be specific, both sides agreed to proceed from the fact that as a result of a 50 percent reduction in carriers, each would have the same number of nuclear warheads--6,000 units each--which would ensure that the strategic balance was maintained but at a radically reduced level.

The question of halting the arms race was the basic one in the negotiations of M.S. Gorbachev and R. Reagan in Geneva. However, it was not possible to find a resolution to it at the meeting. The American leadership's unwillingness to abandon its "star wars" program did not allow concrete accords to be reached.

In developing its program of preparations for the citing of space-strike weapons, the U.S. Administration is passing it off as "defense measures" which is supposedly aimed at strengthening international security through stabilization of the strategic situation and, in the final analysis, at getting rid of nuclear weapons altogether. In other words, the anti-missile "shield," which is outwardly attractive to the inexperienced, is to devalue the nuclear "sword".

But the advertisement for the "Strategic Defense Initiative" does not conform to reality. The creation of space-based weapons is not at all of a defensive nature. It is integrated into the general complex of U.S. military preparations aimed at acquiring the capability of inflicting a disarming first strike.

The development [razrabotka] and deployment [razvertyvaniye] of space-based systems are intended to ensure an unpunished attack on the USSR using offensive nuclear weapons under cover of these systems. Moreover, space-based weapons themselves are also weapons (of a qualitatively new type) capable of destroying not only missiles in flight, but also ground targets.

It is quite clear that this kind of "defense" cannot contribute to curtailing the arms race; on the contrary, it would raise the arms race to an immeasurably higher level. What would happen would not be a simple addition of space-based weapons to nuclear ones, but a powerful acceleration of the entire interconnected process of creating offensive and defense weapons. The dynamics and qualitative characteristics of the arms race would fundamentally change. The marked intensification in the American side's aspiration to move into the lead, implementing the accelerated creation [sozdaniye] and deployment [razvertyvaniye] of nuclear and space-based weapons with the aim of achieving superiority, would inevitably call forth a timely and commensurate response, the aim of which would be to prevent the military-strategic balance from being upset. However, this would mean that the system of "action and counteraction," which is complicated in any case, would become even more complex. Uncertainty and unpredictability would rise sharply. There would be an intensified risk of fatal conflict as a result of accident, miscalculation, or faulty computer systems.

If the placing of weapons in space is not prevented, it will not be possible to rely on the strengthening of strategic stability. The destructive interaction of space-based and nuclear weapons threatens to put the strategic situation in a chaotic state. It goes without saying that the possibilities of reducing the accumulated stocks of nuclear weapons would be nullified, and indeed the entire disarmament process would run up against serious obstacles. As a result, a most serious blow would be dealt to international security.

The position of the Soviet Union is clear: Space must remain free of weapons. They must not be created. Under a mutual ban, strict control could be established, including opening corresponding laboratories for inspection [inspekt-siya].

As a result of the Geneva summit meeting, the sides agreed to accelerate fulfillment of the tasks set in the joint Soviet-American statement of 8 January 1985: To prevent the arms race in space and to halt it on earth, to limit and reduce nuclear weapons, and to strengthen strategic stability. This principled accord must be concretely embodied in the process of the negotiations on nuclear and space-based weapons. In spite of the substantial differences between the sides' positions, there is a real possibility of drawing them closer together if they both strive for compromises in the interest of deep cuts in strategic weapons, on condition, of course, that the arms race is not allowed to spread into space. Neither is the way closed toward an agreement on medium-range nuclear weapons in Europe. It is clear that there is a considerable amount of work to be done, but the very fact that negotiations are being conducted must not serve as a justification and cover for the arms race.

It is not easy to move the cause of curbing the arms race from a standstill, but it is perhaps no easier to accelerate it and to strive for weighty results. It is not only the fierce resistance of the forces of militarism that will have to be overcome. Another constraint is the routine -- formed under the negative influence of confrontation -- of the very process of developing proposals and conducting negotiations and the fixed patterns that have taken root in this process and which long ago showed that they were unproductive and hopeless. Movement is hindered by an artificial linking of heterogeneous issues, by irrevocable rigidity to the detriment of the search for compromise solutions, by the advancement of unacceptable proposals, by the substitution of practical discussion with an aspiration to win propaganda points, and by fruitless discussions on numbers and petty trading.

At the present stage the negotiation process is essentially lagging behind the arms buildup. Only an innovative and creative approach is capable of leading to the revision of obsolete concepts and ineffectual methods. In conditions of parity, large-scale and essentially political solutions can and must be sought to the problems of arms limitation and reduction, as can ways of moving forward toward real disarmament. An example of such an approach is the wide-scale complex of new initiatives on curbing the arms race advanced by the Soviet Union on 15 January 1986. These initiatives embrace the entire range of weapons -- nuclear, space-based, chemical, and conventional.

At the center of the proposed measures stands the concrete program of the total liquidation of nuclear weapons all over the world, a program designed for the period up to the end of this century. The USSR and the United States should begin the consistent stage-by-stage reduction of arsenals of these weapons, with a ban on the creation [sozdaniye], testing [ispytaniye], and deployment [razvertyvaniye] of space-strike weapons. Other nuclear powers would then become involved in this process, making it possible in the final analysis to conclude nuclear disarmament everywhere by the year 2000. It is necessary to develop a universal accord so that nuclear weapons never reappear. Verification [kontrol] over destroyed and reduced weapons would be implemented by national technical means and by on-site inspection [inspektsiya na meste].

This is a constructive alternative to the U.S. program of creating [sozdaniye] a space-based, anti-missile system. If the U.S. Administration is really striving to rid the world of nuclear weapons, as it has declared, then there is a real possibility of a settlement. Instead of constructing a "shield" in space at the cost of enormous expenditures and of the undermining of strategic stability, it is more sensible to liquidate nuclear weapons.

The time has come to put an end to all nuclear explosions. Guided by the aspiration to undertake another practical step in this direction, the Soviet Union adopted a decision, within the context of the program of nuclear disarmament, to extend its unilateral moratorium on any nuclear explosions starting 1 January 1986. It was not a simple decision since the United States was continuing nuclear tests. The logic of the arms race suggested that they be resumed on the Soviet side, too. But, nevertheless, the Soviet Union proposed once again that the vicious circle of "action and counteraction" be abandoned.

There are no convincing arguments against a nuclear test ban, including what concerns the problems of control [kontrol]. Both sides have an interest in control. In conditions of mutual distrust it is no less necessary to the Soviet Union than it is to the United States. Verification of the observance of a concrete accord -- whether by national technical means or international verification -- cannot and must not be a stumbling block.

The USSR is decisively in favor of the moratorium on nuclear explosions becoming bilateral and then multilateral. It is also in favor of the resumption of trilateral Soviet-U.S.-British negotiations on a total and general ban on nuclear weapons tests. The Soviet Union is ready, too, for multilateral negotiations on a test ban to begin without delay within the framework of the Geneva Conference on Disarmament, negotiations in which all nuclear powers would participate.

The new Soviet initiatives proceed from the need for an urgent solution to other disarmament problems and for a reduction in the level of military confrontation.

The USSR is in favor of the swift and total liquidation of such barbaric means of mass destruction as chemical weapons. It also proposes the liquidation of the very industrial base for the manufacture of these weapons and the destruction of all accumulated stocks of them under strict control [kontrol], including international on-site inspection [proverka na mestakh].

The Soviet Union proposes that as well as the removal of weapons of mass destruction from states' arsenals, conventional weapons and armed forces should become the subject of agreed reductions. This could be initiated by an accord at the Vienna negotiations, where the contours are being delineated for a possible decision on a reduction of Soviet and U.S. troops and on the subsequent freezing of the level of both armed forces in central Europe. It would be possible to establish reasonable verification [kontrol] of the observance of the agreement, including control points to observe the entry of any troop contingents into the zone of the reduction.

The USSR is ready to contribute in every way to progress at the Stockholm Conference on Confidence-Building Measures and Security, and Disarmament in Europe. It has become completely feasible to create barriers in the path of the use of force and of secret preparations for war, whether on land, at sea, or in the air. The time has come to eliminate the remaining obstacles that prevent agreement, primarily on the issue of notification of exercises of ground troops, air forces, and navies. It has not been possible so far to resolve this issue as complex, and for this reason the Soviet side proposed that agreement be reached first on notification of large-scale exercises of ground troops and air forces and that the question of naval activity be postponed to the next stage of the conference.

Within the context of the principled decisions capable of exerting a powerful restraining influence on the arms race, wide possibilities open up for determining the balance of the sides' forces at as low a level as possible, with the components of these forces, which differ in quantitative and qualitative parameters, being comprehensively equalized.

There is no need at all to strive for "mirror image" reductions. Moreover, a fascination with symmetry only harms matters. The main task is to achieve a substantial reduction in the level of confrontation on the basis of general quality and total reciprocity and to move forward to disarmament. The Soviet Union is displaying goodwill here. If there is a mutual, radical decrease in the number of nuclear warheads

At an equal point, it is ready for there to be a certain number of barriers in favor of the United States. Within the framework of the process of a general reduction of armed forces and weapons in central Europe, it would agree to a certain reduction in the number of its own forces as compared with the U.S. forces in the first stage. These are not unilateral concessions, but a constructive contribution to the cause of consistent curtailment of the arms race.

Neither are the unilateral steps in the same direction concessions. It is quite clear that the way toward agreement is laid by both sides. Reciprocity cannot be avoided here. Even if unilateral measures do not bring about a counter-movement -- and the Soviet Union has to face the absence of reciprocity from the United States -- even then the initiative is not in vain, because it augments the positive moral-political potential that is expected to serve as an impetus basis in the struggle for disarmament for the foreseeable future.

The complex of new Soviet initiatives in the beginning of 1964 contain a powerful charge of energy and purposefulness so necessary in order to put into motion the entire existing system of negotiations in the sphere of arms limitation and reduction. To achieve a genuine "breakthrough" in this main area of international affairs is to implement a real advance toward ensuring security for all people and states.

IV

International security has global and regional levels. At the higher, global level, where the states of the two world systems oppose each other and cooperate, the central problem of preventing nuclear war is being solved. At the regional level, the interests of states in this region are interwoven with those of external forces, and the urgent question here is primarily one of overcoming conflict situations. There is naturally no clear dividing line between these two levels. They are combined in part and they interact vigorously. It stands to reason that the global level is dominant, but the regional level is far from being a simple projection of it. The central problem -- war and peace -- leaves the strongest mark on the development of events regionally, while regional problems, particularly those connected with international conflicts -- whether of local origin or those caused by outside interference -- influence the political climate all over the world to a great degree.

Regional conflicts are diverse in form, as is the contemporary world, particularly the extensive zone of developing countries. They arise as a result of conflicts between local forces, but are deepened and inflamed by the policy of imperialism. As a result, conflicts become prolonged, chronic, and not subject to settlement.

Indeed, settlement does not even enter the calculations of those imperialist circles, particularly the United States, which aims to use regional conflicts to their own advantage, these conflicts occupying an intermediate position between a large war and general peace in their minds. Furthermore, they intentionally bring conflicts to the critical limit and play with the fate of millions of people. Ideological intolerance is embodied in crude interference in the affairs of sovereign states, in the waging of undeclared wars and overt and covert subversive operations against them, in the policy of state terrorism, and in other dangerous activities by the United States. Great-power ambitions are expressed in the aspiration for hegemony in regions that have arbitrarily been declared as "zones of exclusive interests" of the United States.

The regional aspects of U.S. policy are inseparable from global ones. The general line of drawing entire regions into the world system of military-political confrontation is to be seen in both. Not only on the periphery of the Soviet Union, but also in the most remote corners of the world the United States is spreading its strong points, preparing bridgeheads for confrontation, and involving potential allies in its wide-scale military preparations. The most bellicose groups of U.S. ruling circles make use of regional conflicts they themselves have inflamed as a justification for their policy of confrontation on a global level and as a pretext for undermining the positive trends in world affairs. They need regional unrest in order to whip up the atmosphere of tension all over the world.

The problem of regional conflicts was discussed in the course of the Soviet-American summit meeting. Both sides expressed concern on this point; since the development of conflicts carries an implicit threat to international security. However, profound differences were found in the approaches of the USSR and the United States to the causes of conflicts and the methods of eliminating them. On the U.S. side, prevalent was the now anachronistic viewpoint according to which almost any conflict, wherever it arises, is a result of the rivalry between the two world systems. In this connection, the interests of the states of this or that region and the right of people to determine their fate by themselves were ignored. The Soviet state declared its resolute disagreement with such manifestations of imperial thinking.

One of the most important aims of Soviet foreign policy is its principled line of settling regional crisis situations on the basis of respect for the inalienable right of every person to freedom and independence and for the right to independent development without outside interference. The USSR proceeds from the point of the impermissibility of threats and the use of armed force and from the urgent need to liquidate conflicts by peaceful means through a search for mutually acceptable decisions.

Speaking to the heads of diplomatic representations accredited to Moscow at a meeting in the Kremlin on 27 December 1985, M.S. Gorbachev stated: "The Soviet Union has firmly decided to make substantial progress during 1986 on the topic of political settlements in the Near East, in Central America, around Afghanistan, in the South of Africa, and in the Persian Gulf region. We are ready to seek just solutions in cooperation with other countries, and to participate -- where this is necessary -- in corresponding guarantees."

The political settlement of regional conflict situations can and must become an important support for the strengthening of general security. The community of peoples' security interests is indivisible. Improvement of the situation in any region is beneficial for the state of affairs all over the world.

Nowhere is this law, governing contemporary international life, displayed more convincingly than in Europe. The political climate here largely depends on the development of the entire complex of East-West mutual relations. In turn, the state of all-European affairs has a marked effect on world policy.

Europe's potential for love of peace and its collective state wisdom engendered the policy of international detente and the Helsinki process of strengthening security and developing cooperation. Each European country has made its own contribution. A balance of security interests of the states of Europe and North America has been formed. This is common property, and it is necessary to preserve and augment it through joint efforts and to strive for a shift to more stable, secure relations between states. The Soviet Union and the other socialist states are taking the most active part and are acting to overcome the splitting of Europe into opposing groups in the foreseeable future.

But even in conditions where two military-political alliances exist, it is possible to ensure such a balance of military forces at a lower level as would substantially blunt the acuteness of the present confrontation. The creation of stable conditions of security and confidence on the European continent would make it possible to develop mutually advantageous cooperation in all spheres even more widely and intensively.

Europe's positive experience could serve as an example for other regions, naturally taking their specific nature into account. It stands to reason that the problems and ways of ensuring security form in their own manner in different regions of the world, with the participation of a wide range of interested countries. As far as the Soviet Union is concerned, it is ready to contribute in every way to the creation of reliable security zones all over the world.

The USSR attaches significance to strengthening security in the vast region of Asia and the Pacific Ocean. Together with its socialist allies and friends, it is acting so this region not be a source of tension or a sphere of dangerous military confrontation and in order that the political dialogue widens between all states situated there in the interests of peace, good-neighborliness, mutual trust, and cooperation.

Implementation of the program of nuclear disarmament and liquidation of chemical weapons would fundamentally change the situation in Asia. It would free the people in this part of the globe from the fear of the nuclear and chemical threat and would raise security in the region to a qualitatively new level.

The Nonaligned Movement is capable of making a great contribution to improving the international situation on the Asian Continent and far beyond its frontiers. The Soviet Union is developing comprehensive cooperation with India, which has a positive role here.

The USSR is consistently conducting a principled line in the sphere of Soviet-Chinese relations and is in favor for serious improvement in the relations. It proceeds from a conviction of the need to restore good-neighborliness and comprehensive cooperation with the People's Republic of China, which would correspond to the fundamental interests of the Soviet and Chinese people and would contribute to strengthening security in Asia.

The Soviet Union is in favor of better relations with Japan. This is necessary in the interests of ensuring security in the Asian and Pacific region, and indeed in the interests of eliminating the nuclear threat altogether. The interests of the USSR and Japan cannot but coincide here.

The construction of a general security system requires the wide-scale inclusion of various regions of the world. It can scarcely be expected that movement toward this goal will be rapid and unimpeded. But everywhere -- from Central America to the Near East and from the Mediterranean to Southeast Asia -- the objective preconditions are being created for a shift from dangerous tension to peaceful mutual relations. The aspiration for reliable security is growing stronger in these regions, and it is being intensified by a trend toward detente and cooperation in all international developments.

There has never before been such a threatening danger in the world as that which now hangs over it in the nuclear age. Neither has there ever been in the past such a need for cooperation to solve problems common to all mankind as that need that now

makes itself known as an imperative in our time. For the first time in history, the broadest community of interests of the human species in preventing its own death and in combining efforts for its own good is forming.

It is here that a real possibility of ensuring lasting peace between people exists. In order to transform this possibility into reality, it is necessary to master the skill of living together on our planet, to renounce the inflammation of enmity on the grounds of differences of ideology and social systems, to display mutual restraints, to put an end to confrontation and the arms race, and to strive for general and reliable security.

The course of peace and disarmament has been the pivot of the Soviet Union's foreign policy. In actively conducting it the USSR is ready for the broadest interaction with all who are acting from positions of reason, goodwill, and awareness of the responsibility for ensuring mankind's future without wars and without weapons.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatelstvo TsK KPSS "Pravda". "Mirovaya ekonomika i mezhdunarodnyye otnosheniya". 1986.

/7358

CSO: 5200/1365

RELATED ISSUES

SOVIET TALK SHOW ON LESSONS OF CHERNOBYL, WESTERN REACTION

LD171811 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1405 GMT 17 May 86

["Studio Nine" program presented by Valentin Zorin with Academician Nikita Nikolayevich Moiseyev, deputy director of the Computer Center at the USSR Academy of Sciences; Lev Petrovich Feoktistov, deputy director of the Kurchatov Atomic Institute of the USSR Academy of Sciences; and Aleksandr Yevgeniyevich Bovin, Political Observer with IZVESTIYA]

[Excerpts] [Zorin] Hello, comrades! We are meeting you on "Studio Nine" at the Ostankino Television Center to talk about topical problems of world politics. Today's guests on "Studio Nine" are Academician Nikita Nikolayevich Moiseyev, deputy director of the Computer Center at the USSR Academy of Sciences. Nikita Nikolayevich's work has received recognition throughout the world and his mathematical calculations connected with the consequences and evaluation of the so-called nuclear winter are particularly well known. The next guest is Lev Petrovich Feoktistov, a well-known Soviet physicist and deputy director of the Kurchatov Atomic Energy Institute at the USSR Academy of Sciences and a corresponding member of the Academy of Sciences. Also with us is Aleksandr Yevgeniyevich Bovin, Political Observer with the newspaper IZVESTIYA.

Well, I think that the very participants in our conversation today make it possible for you to guess that it will be focusing on events connected with the calamity that has befallen us, that is, the accident at the Chernobyl nuclear power station.

This accident has become not only a fact of our domestic life but also an event which has given rise to broad scale response abroad. Honest people throughout the world have shown sympathy toward the Soviet people and many have offered their help and support. Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev, speaking on television, has said thank you on behalf of the Soviet people for this attitude.

But unfortunately, the unprecedentedly large-scale anti-Soviet campaign has also become a fact. This campaign has been unleashed by the bourgeois mass media with the participation of certain official figures, primarily American ones. As Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev noted in his television address, they needed a pretext to latch on to and try to discredit the Soviet Union and its foreign policy and to weaken the effect of Soviet proposals on stopping nuclear tests and eliminating nuclear weapons, and at the same time to calm the growing criticism of the behavior of the United States in the international arena and of its militarist course.

The accident in the atomic reactor at the Chernobyl atomic power station reminds people once again of the stern realities of the nuclear age. Nikita Nikolayevich, by virtue of your activities you are engaged in the overall aspects of this problem. What can you say in this connection?

[Moiseyev] Indeed, there are many dangers. They often lie hidden in unexpected places and this nuclear age is now placing very special demands and requirements upon science. We must indeed learn to make forecasts in advance, because the cost of every mistake is very high.

And on the other hand we have to be able to draw a definite lesson from every difficulty and from every misfortune. It seemed to me that the Chernobyl accident, a misfortune for all of us, must serve as a lesson not just for ourselves -- for ourselves, of course, it will serve as a lesson, for our people; our specialists will long be engaged on it and in a proper way -- but it must serve as a lesson for the whole world, too.

Today we are linked much more than we ever were. Just think for a second about the fact that the Gulf of Mexico, where quite a lot of oil is produced, will today be covered by a monomolecular film as a consequence of pollution, but for a relatively short time. And totally new manifestations, linked with the structure of the Gulf Stream, with the exchange of energy between the atmosphere and the ocean, are now going to make their appearance and Europe is going to feel this immediately, Europe first and foremost.

In order to stress the way this is linked I would give the following example. We not only register without difficulty every explosion that is carried out in Nevada, we even register changes in the atmospheric mechanism in Moscow which is the result of an underground explosion in Nevada. So, understand just how small our planet is today and tied into a single knot by its problems. And here, what Mikhail Sergeyevich said in his television appearance on Wednesday is a most necessary condition for man's survival upon earth. International cooperation in science is essential; thorough international work on studying the possibilities that mankind has at its disposal is essential, as is the raising of the reliability of all this equipment, of all that is being placed into our hands today.

Mikhail Sergeyevich named the IAEA and named the United Nations. I was a participant in a SCOPE program -- an international organization linked with the ecological consequences of nuclear war. This work was extraordinarily effective. Documents were issued that added up the results of a whole series of important work carried out in different countries. It seems to me that this path, involving such large international programs, ought to be expanded.

There exist not only these international organizations already mentioned, but many others, like the Life Institute, a letter from the chairman of which Mikhail Sergeyevich sent a reply -- as you know. As you remember, I would say it was a very friendly reply. Cooperation in different research is also possible within the framework of this institute: After all, the institute is aimed at the prevention of all those dangers that are presented to life on this planet by technology and its development. Today much has already been done for this and I think that it is essential for scientists to show more initiative, because scientists must find a common dialogue among themselves -- one that does not have the poisonous sting of propaganda and speculation that are made on the basis of all manner of difficulties.

[Feoktistov] There is a point that I would like to make...

[Zorin, interrupting] Yes, yes.

[Feoktistov] Something that Nikita Nikolayevich has just reminded me about, something that I had in mind. You know the connection that exist between countries, or between events that take place. Take the underground nuclear explosions being conducted by the Americans that we just mentioned. Xanon, or radioactive noble gases, enter the atmosphere, right? They do not come from a reactor, you know, which is above ground and covered by a roof but nothing else, do they?

It takes place perhaps 200 meters under the earth, deep down. The test takes place and radioactive gas escapes -- radioactive gas that 10,000 kilometers away, when the wind blows in the right direction, starts to be definitely registered somewhere around Moscow.

[Zorin] In connection with what we have been saying, I find it an amazing and, to put it bluntly, a worrying fact that the West, where both officials and propaganda have stirred up a very big campaign, is focusing attention on the explosion at the Chernobyl AES [Atomic Energy Station], while at the same time they fail to mention the enormous quantity of nuclear charges in the world's nuclear arsenals, pretending that the fact does not exist, pretending that the situation whereby the world literally lives on this -- not powder keg -- but atomic keg does not exist. Everything is brought down to this tragic, but individual case, and bourgeois officials are trying to avoid making any conclusions and trying to detract public opinion. I would like to ask you, Aleksandr Yevgeniyevich, to speak on this subject, because what has just happened stresses yet again very vividly the fact that people are living in a nuclear age and are coming up against things connected with that age; and of course the consequences of what happened in Chernobyl will also have an effect in the area of international politics. Could you give us your point of view on this?

[Bovin] Well, you have in fact formulated the essence of the matter correctly. We really are sitting on top of this nuclear keg and this is not the best situation for mankind to find itself in. So what happens in the Ukraine, the escape of radioactivity, has enabled us once more to make an assessment of the most vital problem in politics today, bringing it out more clearly -- the problem of nuclear disarmament. And precisely in the light of what happened in the Ukraine, our persistent policy of demanding nuclear disarmament shows itself ever more to be the actual embodiment of real humanism in our time, because it's impossible to devise anything else. Perhaps some alternative to atomic energy may be devised -- I don't know -- but there is no alternative that you can devise for nuclear disarmament. So all the proposals that we have made remain in force, and we will be continuing to pursue this line because, I repeat, there's no alternative to it.

There are many issues here, but let's take specifically a problem which, it would seem, is as close to a solution as it could be, that is, the problem of banning nuclear tests. Think how many times talks have been held. Agreements have been signed that unfortunately the Americans have not ratified. A lot has been done. Just a few steps are left to be taken and if the Americans had the political will there would be no problem here: It would be possible to reach agreement.

What in fact does a nuclear explosion entail? Recently THE WASHINGTON POST reported that during these tests there were 97 escapes of radioactive gases, even though they

also take all sorts of precautionary measures. But even that is not the main thing. The banning of nuclear explosions and nuclear weapons tests is a very real path towards, perhaps not reducing nuclear arsenals, but putting a brake on the arms race. And how many times have the Americans said: no, no, no, no -- yet we have taken yet another noble and courageous step by extending our nuclear moratorium to 6 August, although I'm not very sure that our military comrades are happy about it, so to speak, because they have their own problems and their own concerns, and this is quite understandable. But from the point of view of the overall political situation this decision was, of course, absolutely correct.

And it once again gives America a choice, so to speak. Again, there you are, take your choice, we are giving you the opportunity. But what do the Americans do? It's simply -- well, I just do not know what to call it. First of all, they kept going on about monitoring -- monitoring, monitoring, monitoring, monitoring.

Now, however, the situation seems to be such that there is a possibility of reaching agreement on monitoring. Then what do they say: While nuclear weapons exist, we will carry out tests. But our logic is that in order to create the conditions for reducing those weapons, the tests must be banned. They turn everything upside down.

Weinberger recently said this: When we put our "star wars" program into operation and we correspondingly make atomic weapons obsolete, then we will negotiate on banning nuclear weapons. Well, what sort of logic is this? Everything is turned inside out. And all this hullaballo being made about the Chernobyl accident -- while it is difficult to talk about the intention, of course -- looks like a sort of smokescreen to distract people from what really are the most urgent questions, the problems, I repeat, of nuclear disarmament.

[Moiseyev] Aleksandr Yevgeniyevich, you know there's some logic here that I can't follow. A tragic event has happened and it would seem that it should teach people something. We have already spoken about the comparison with a nuclear war and so forth, and it would seem that man, including every American, should simply stop and think: Where are we going, what are we doing? So why, then, is the Chernobyl accident itself being used, why is it being marshalled into propaganda to urge people to continue arming? Where is the logic here?

[Bovin] That in fact is the logic of, if you like, imperialist policy. It's all along the same lines. If they don't want, for example, to end nuclear tests, if they don't want real disarmament, if they actually want to launch the arms race into space, if they have put together an enormous program for modernising their weapons -- then within the framework of that logic, for them what happened in Chernobyl is of course no reason to change their views, but on the contrary it spurs them on to take such action. In the context of their approach it's all understandable. Why should they use Chernobyl against themselves? In your opinion, yes, Chernobyl should make us work more actively toward disarmament. Yes, that's your logic, but for them...

[Feoktistov, interrupting] I want to say that this is the logic of a normal person.

[Bovin] Yes, that's right, the logic of a normal being. But they have their own logic. And what's advantageous is that which works in favor of their policy and that is the policy of the arms race.

[Moiseyev] I understand my colleague very well indeed, because it is simply impossible for a normal Soviet person to understand this logic.

[Bovin] Yes, I am completely in agreement with that.

[Zorin] And continuing our deliberations on this topic I want to return to this propaganda campaign. Instead of thinking over some serious measures, instead of drawing serious conclusions requiring new thinking and the ability to think in terms of the realities of our day, a petty, ugly, uncivilized propaganda campaign is being undertaken with the object of scoring some kind of propaganda points.

I think that this campaign was prepared independently of the Chernobyl tragedy. It was prepared before that happened. The Americans, by all accounts, felt a need for grounds of some kind for developing this kind of campaign. We know of similar cases.

Remember how, at the end of the seventies certain circles in the United States came out against the SALT II treaty which had already been signed in Vienna and there was nothing at hand for them to use: Some story was invented about a mythical Soviet military brigade in Cuba, this was developed into an improbable campaign, with the help of which the ratification of the treaty did not take place. Incidentally, it is curious that since then they have found other grounds for anti-Soviet propaganda campaigns and that is why in the last 5 or 6 years there has not been a single mention in the United States of this mythical brigade in Cuba: And so they forgot about it.

In the present instance too, one gets the impression that they were waiting for grounds to start a campaign of this kind. And what is involved here is not just the absence of some kind of civilized manners or an understanding of the fact that you must not dance at misfortune, you must not gloat when something like this occurs, but there is also a definite political design here.

The United States has of late found itself totally on the political defensive. The Soviet Union is advancing one constructive proposal after another -- proposals that are meeting with the understanding and support of broad circles of the international public. And, every time, the world hears --no! no! no! -- from Washington. In these circumstances an attempt has evidently been made to make use of the misfortune that has happened in our country to whip up an anti-Soviet campaign, to engender mistrust towards the Soviet Union, to generate some kind of anti-Soviet sentiments and deflect the attention of the international public from this stance of Washington's.

Summing up the general political conclusions that must be drawn from the Chernobyl tragedy, Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev stressed: We understand that this is yet another ring of the bell, another stern warning that the nuclear age requires fresh political thinking and fresh policies. This has strengthened even further our conviction that the foreign policy course worked out by the 27th CPSU Congress is correct and that our proposals for the full elimination of nuclear weapons, the halting of nuclear blasts, and for the creation of a comprehensive system of international security are in line with the implacably stern demands that the nuclear age places on the political leadership of all countries.

And that is what we have been talking about today, that is what people in the whole world are thinking about today. Our airtime has run out. It remains for me to thank you for taking part in the discussion, to thank our viewers for their attention and to bid them farewell until our next meeting here in our 'Studio Nine.' Thank you.

/7358

CSO: 5200/1365

RELATED ISSUES

MOSCOW DAILY DENOUNCES ADELMAN'S REMARKS ON CHERNOBYL

PM201402 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 18 May 86 First Edition p 5

[Mikhail Ozerov rejoinder: "Exploiting Misfortune"]

[Text] It is common knowledge that different people react differently to other people's grief. Most people respond with sympathy and a desire to help. But some feel the complete opposite -- outright malice.

That is precisely the response of some statesmen on the Potomac. The Chernobyl AES [atomic energy station] accident has caused in them... a surge of joy. Soviet people are heroically combating the disaster, risking their lives, even dying, but across the ocean people are rubbing their hands with glee, saying, that is fine, that serves them right, let us take advantage of this.

Now Kenneth Adelman has spoken in Congress. He holds a high and prestigious post: director of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency. Surely he will speak knowledgeably about what happened.

Fat chance... Mr Adelman began by saying that the Soviet reports on the number of casualties were "not serious." The more he said, the worse it got: The speaker set about painting a series of increasingly gloomy pictures for the assembly. A threat of destruction hangs over Kiev... The graphite will burn for a long time after the accident... And so on and so forth. In general, then, if you believe Adelman, all the information coming from the USSR is "ridiculous." What can we say about this? Reality today demonstrates that it is the figures cited by our country that are correct, not those cited by Mr Adelman. This has just been confirmed by Adelman's fellow-countrymen, Professor R. Gale from California and Dr A. Hammer, the well known U.S. businessman, who helped us in our plight. At a press conference in Moscow, R. Gale said that the preliminary Soviet assessments of the radiation doses and treatment strategies were as far as possible **ABSOLUTELY CORRECT** [preceding words published in boldface]. And the IAEA document notes that the "level of radioactivity in the Kiev reservoirs was normal all the time." Why did Adelman need to confuse the issue? For the same reason as a number of other high-ranking members of the U.S. Administration. Yes, the U.S. Administration was united on this question with the most right-wing publications across the ocean. As Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev said on 14 May, "official Washington's conduct during these difficult days is deeply disappointing: It represents a disgraceful exploitation of misfortune, shameless attempts to use what has happened to discredit all the Soviet Union's policy, and to instill mistrust in its peace-loving initiatives." What we are seeing is flagrant cynicism and a desire to extract the maximum political capital from the disaster by presenting the tragedy in Chernobyl as an inevitable link in the chain of the "erroneous policy" of the USSR, with whom, they say, they should have no dealings.

What else can such a stance cause except indignation? Press organs and state and social figures from the most diverse countries are now resolutely condemning the campaign launched by Washington. "The atmosphere of fear and even hysteria that has been constantly fueled recently is utterly unacceptable," S. Khayselbert, member of the Danish parliament, stated, for example. Ordinary Americans are also incensed at their authorities' stand. This is demonstrated, for example, by their letters and telegrams that are arriving in Moscow. In general, as life itself shows, it is not the Soviet information on the Chernobyl accident that is absurd and ridiculous but the position taken by high-ranking Americans.

/7358

CSO: 5200/1365

RELATED ISSUES

GROMYKO RECEIVES ITALIAN CHRISTIAN ASSOCIATION PRESIDENT

LD191836 Moscow TASS in English 1805 GMT 19 May 86

[Text] Moscow May 19 TASS -- Member of the Political Bureau of the CPSU Central Committee President of the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet Andrey Gromyko received in the Kremlin on May 19 president of the Christian Association of Italian Working People Domenico Rosati who is staying in the Soviet Union at the invitation of the Soviet Committee for European Security and Cooperation.

Their conversation which passes in a warm and friendly atmosphere was devoted to the problem of the struggle for peace. The association's president said that the organization he represents is one of the most influential public organizations of Italy and has a membership of over half a million. He emphasized that the main aim of the struggle of the organization he heads is to exert every effort to prevent nuclear war.

"The events in Chernobyl," Domenico Rosati said, "have shown what danger is posed by nuclear energy that went out of control. What has happened also compels everyone who declares for peace to step up greatly their activity in the struggle against nuclear weapons".

The Soviet side expressed satisfaction with the fact the USSR peace initiatives set out in the statements of general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee Mikhail Gorbachev and in the documents of the 27th party congress met with understanding of broad public of Italy.

"The Soviet Union holds that the 15 years that remain to go before the end of the 20th century are enough to put an end to nuclear threat and to agree on non-emplacement of strike arms in space", Andrey Gromyko said. "These proposals are on the table of the President of the United States in the White House and on the tables of governments in other countries".

"The concrete, clear-cut Soviet programme of the elimination of nuclear weapons everywhere is also aimed at creating an all-embracing system of international security, also a system of European security. The peoples should compel their political leaders, adherents to the arms race, to exert efforts to bring about its end, not to widen its scopes. This is a feasible task. It is only political will and resolve that are needed.

"But the Soviet proposals are blocked by those circles of the United States that imposed the arms race on the world and obsessively exert efforts to spread it.

"On many other directions of its foreign policy, Washington acts in such a way to whip up still more tension in various areas of the world. This is shown by the act of aggression against independent Libya -- the bombing of its cities. The undeclared war against Nicaragua which the United States is waging with the use of hired terrorists is in the mainstream of the same course.

"Thus, in foreign affairs the U.S. Administration is acting not in the direction on which it was agreed during the summit meeting in Geneva. The United States, specifically, does not observe the agreed upon provision that both countries will not be seeking to achieve military superiority. And the whole world knows that the United States does not even agree to end nuclear weapon tests even though peoples, one might say, damn those who resist the ban on this testing.

"The accident at the Chernobyl atomic power station, above all, convinced people once again that there must be most serious efforts to eliminate nuclear weapons. Precisely this opinion is now expressed by all those who demand that such solutions be found that would preclude nuclear menace in all its types forever.

"Thus the struggle of those who oppose the arms race against those who continue it is the struggle between life and death. All countries are under the same roof -- our common skies. The Soviet Union favours the triumph of life, not the grim philosophy of turning the earth into a nuclear cemetery".

In conclusion of the conversation Andrey Gromyko noted that people in the Soviet Union appreciate the efforts of all organisations declaring for peace, regardless of their political or religious views, differences in their ideological views. People in our country have a positive attitude also to the anti-war activity of the Christian Association of Italian Working People.

/7358

CSO: 5200/1365

RELATED ISSUES

TASS: FRG'S RAU SUPPORTS SOVIET PROPOSALS

LD142003 Moscow TASS in English 1851 GMT 14 May 86

[Text] Duesseldorf May 14 TASS--"The Social Democrats of the FRG welcome and support the USSR's proposals both on nuclear disarmament and on a considerable cut in conventional weapons and armed forces", a group of Soviet newsmen was told here by Johannes Rau, minister-president of North Rhine-Westphalia, the leading SPD candidate to the post of federal chancellor in the general parliamentary elections scheduled for early next year. These initiatives are the biggest proposals in the field of nuclear weapons cuts, that have ever been put forward in the world. They can serve as a solid basis for the resolution of urgent problems of putting an end to the arms race and of disarmament," he said [quotation marks as received].

The Social Democrat leader at the forthcoming FRG Bundestag elections again stressed that if he came to power at the head of the government, he would make efforts to ensure the start of a new stage of detente, to press ahead for the withdrawal from that country within the shortest time possible of U.S. nuclear "Pershing-2" and cruise missiles, a revision of the agreement reached with Washington on the FRG's participation in research work within the framework of the "Strategic Defense Initiative". Johannes Rau said that the government headed by him would conclude with the GDR leadership an agreement to create a zone free from chemical weapons in central Europe.

The prime minister of north Rhine-Westphalia said that to resolve all these problems he would have to ensure NATO's approval, to convince the FRG's allies of expediency of such a policy. He evaded giving an answer to questions pertaining to concrete steps of the Social Democrats to meet their election pledges.

Touching upon the accident at the Chernobyl nuclear power plant, Johannes Rau said that the discussion started around it in the West had nothing to do with the development of the East-West contacts and relations and ties of the Social Democrats with the Soviet Union.

/7358

CSO: 5200/1365

RELATED ISSUES

PRAVDA REPORTER ASSAILS KOHL REMARKS ON ARMS ISSUES

LD191002 Moscow TASS in English 0942 GMT 19 May 86

[Quotation marks as received]

[Excerpt] Moscow May 19 TASS--Follows the full text of Yuliy Yakhontov's dispatch from Bonn published in "PRAVDA" today.

"FRG Chancellor Helmut Kohl addressed the annual gathering of the 'Land Association of Sedeten Germans' in Munich, the capital of Bavaria.

He has thus disregarded the calls by the country's public and political figures that he should not participate in that clearly dubious function regularly held by those who openly lay claim to socialist Czechoslovakia's territory, demand a revision of the results of the Second World War.

The chancellor deemed it necessary to stress pointedly his closeness to the 'expellees'. He also credited them with repudiating 'revenge and retribution'. lauded to the skies their 'contribution to the FRG's formation'.

"The pronouncements by Helmut Kohl on the problems of peace, albeit he mentioned in passing his wish to cooperate with the Warsaw Treaty member states, contained quite frank calls for strengthening defence in the face of a 'military threat' and what he described as political blackmail 'resulting from military power and superiority'. Albeit the countries from where that threat allegedly stems were not named, the transport allusion was very well understood.

The speaker again reiterated the already hacknayed slogan of the leadership of the Christian Democratic Union Peace With a Smaller Number of Weapons. In the present-day conditions that call sounded as open mockery, since it is an open secret that the FRG is the sole NATO member country, on whose territory U.S. first strike nuclear missiles "Pershing 2" trained on the USSR are deployed in combat readiness, that it is precisely there that the deployment is proceeding full speed ahead now of another 96 nuclear cruise missiles, which are also a first strike weapon.

"And take the agreement signed between Bonn and Washington on the participation of West German firms in work on the 'stars wars' programme, which served as an expression of political support for the U.S. plan to militarise outer space and simultaneously turned the FRG into an accomplice in a new spiral of the arms race and its spreading into outer space.

Another fact is that the FRG leadership is the first to open that country for the deployment on its territory of U.S. chemical binary weapons and thus gives a blessing to the USA for the production of these weapons.

Albeit the chancellor pointed out that at present there is an 'encouraging situation' in the field of arms control, it could be deduced from his statement that nuclear disarmament and its verification is not at all a very important matter.

/7358

CSO: 5200/1365

RELATED ISSUES

USSR: ROMANIA'S CEAUSESCU DISCUSSES ARMS ISSUES WITH GORBACHEV

PM190857 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 17 May 1986 First Edition p 1

[Friendly Meeting--PRAVDA headline]

[Excerpts] N. Ceausescu, general secretary of the RCP, president of the Socialist Republic of Romania [SRR], is in the Soviet Union 16 May on a friendly working visit at the invitation of the CPSU Central Committee and the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium.

Talks were held in the Kremlin between M.S. Gorbachev, CPSU Central Committee general secretary, and N. Ceausescu, RCP general secretary and president of the SRR. During the talks, the Soviet and Romanian leaders exchanged information on the current socioeconomic development of both countries and on their work to implement the decisions of the 27th CPSU Congress and the 13th RCP Congress.

During an exchange of views on international issues, the leaders expressed serious concern at the tense and dangerous situation that has developed in the world, caused by the continuation of the arms race, especially nuclear, in connection with U.S. and NATO actions. They refuse to embark upon the road of curbing the arms race, stopping nuclear tests, and preventing the militarization of space. Manifestations of the imperialist policy of force and uncerecermonious interference in the internal affairs of other states lately have multiplied in number.

M.S. Gorbachev and N. Ceausescu looked at ways to resolve the fundamental issue of today -- the defense of peace, stopping the arms race, adopting specific measures for disarmament, especially nuclear disarmament, including a ban on nuclear explosions, and eliminating the threat of nuclear catastrophe.

The Socialist Republic of Romania gives great importance to and supports the program that has been proposed by the Soviet Union for step-by-step liquidation of nuclear weapons and other mass destruction means by the end of this century.

Both leaders noted the need to strive resolutely for a substantial reduction of conventional weapons and armed forces and also of military expenditure, and for a comprehensive approach to the issue of disarmament. They advocated developing political dialogue and spoke out against the further buildup of nuclear weapons in Europe and in favor of completely freeing the continent of nuclear weapons -- both medium-range and tactical.

The USSR positively appraises and supports the proposals made by Romania and the People's Republic of Bulgaria on transforming the Balkans into a nuclear- and chemical weapons-free zone. The creation of such zones in various areas of Europe and the world would make an important contribution to ensure peace and international security.

During an exchange of opinions on the progress of the pan-European process, both leaders praised the successful conclusion of the Stockholm Conference. They noted the importance of the forthcoming Vienna meeting between representatives of the participant states in the Helsinki Conference, which should give new impetus to the reinforcement of security in Europe, the return to detente and to the establishment of broad, mutually beneficial cooperation.

M.S. Gorbachev and N. Ceausescu noted the particular importance, in the present international atmosphere, of the unity and cohesion of the Warsaw Pact member-states, which is an effective factor in safeguarding security and peaceful work for their peoples, as well as for the preservation and consolidation of peace in Europe and throughout the world.

The USSR and Romania are fully determined to actively and purposefully cooperate with the other allied socialist states to elaborate and implement an agreed upon policy of peace, security, and international cooperation. They also expressed a readiness to develop relations with the other socialist countries, and with all states, regardless of their sociopolitical system.

The leaders of the CPSU and the RCP stressed that both parties consistently advocate strengthening cooperation, unity, and solidarity among communist and workers parties, and among all progressive and democratic forces in the struggle for detente, disarmament, and peace.

Confidence was expressed that the talks would result in an important contribution to strengthening friendship and expanding comprehensive cooperation between the CPSU and the RCP, and between the Soviet Union and the Socialist Republic of Romania in the interests of the peoples of both countries, the causes of socialism and peace.

N. Ceausescu invited M.S. Gorbachev to visit Romania on a friendly visit. The invitation was accepted with gratitude.

The meeting took place in an atmosphere of friendship and mutual understanding.

/7358

CSO: 5200/1365

RELATED ISSUES

TASS CITES GDR'S HONECKER ON TEST BAN, CHEMICAL WEAPONS

LD162103 Moscow TASS in English 2036 GMT 16 May 86

[Text] Berlin May 16 TASS -- The GDR welcomes the Soviet Union's decision to extend the unilateral moratorium on nuclear testing till August 6 of this year and the readiness expressed by General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee Mikhail Gorbachev to meet without delay with President of the United States Reagan for talks on banning nuclear tests. This was said by General Secretary of the Central Committee of the Socialist Unity Party of Germany, Chairman of the Council of State of the GDR Erich Honecker at a meeting with President-Minister of Baden-Wuerttemberg Land (FRG) Lofhar Spaeth now on a visit in the GDR.

The leader of the GDR stressed that the peaceful initiatives of the USSR, and other socialist countries indicate the road to mankind's future. All efforts must be aimed at preventing nuclear catastrophe, at terminating the arms race on earth and preventing it in space. It is necessary to use even the slightest chance for opposing the increase of the danger of new war.

Erich Honecker noted that the two German states must do everything they can to ensure that war should never start on German land again. But the FRG Government, having concluded the agreement on the participation in the U.S. star wars plans has adopted the decision that hampers relations with socialist countries, that adversely affects the interests of security and cooperation in Europe. In view of the responsibility of both German states for safeguarding peace, they should make a vigorous contribution to detente and disarmament. The banning of chemical weapons and the creation of a zone free from chemical weapons in Europe would be of much importance in this.

/7358

CSO: 5200/1365

RELATED ISSUES

PRAVDA REVIEW OF WEEK'S INTERNATIONAL EVENTS

PM081423 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 4 May 86 First Edition p 4

[Nikolay Prozhogin "International Review"]

[Excerpt] Asset in the Cause of Peace

May is the 5th month of the year. The first third of 1986 -- the year declared the International Year of Peace by the United Nations -- is behind us.

What has been done in this time to implement this noble idea approved of by the international community? We can boldly claim that a considerable amount has been done. Although immeasurably more has still to be done.

The new peace initiatives of the Soviet Union, which forms a united front in the international arena with the other fraternal socialist states, have made a substantial contribution to the cause of peace.

In the New Year of 1986, the Soviet Union announced the extension of the unilateral moratorium it had introduced earlier on all nuclear explosions, simultaneously renewing its appeal to other nuclear powers, primarily the United States, to follow its example.

At the very beginning of 1986 -- on 15 January -- the statement by M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, was published. It contained a detailed program for freeing mankind of nuclear weapons by the year 2000 and preventing the militarization of space.

In February-March 1986, the 27th CPSU Congress was held in Moscow, and from its rostrum an appeal was made to all who are really concerned for the fate of peace on earth to cooperate more closely and effectively to form an all-embracing international security system. The CPSU Central Committee Political Report to the congress set out the principled foundations of such a system and stated at the same time that the Soviet Union is prepared to seriously consider any other proposals leading in this direction.

Oriented toward seeking mutual understanding, toward dialogue, and toward establishing peaceful coexistence as the universal norm in interstate relations, Soviet foreign policy was given a specific program of work by the 27th CPSU Congress to preserve and strengthen peace. In realizing this program, the USSR persistently and unyieldingly strives to eliminate nuclear weapons, radically limit the arms race, prevent the militarization of space, and create reliable international security equal for all.

The new constructive Soviet initiatives have become an asset in the cause of peace. They are a powerful and effective counterweight to the aggressive plans of the most bellicose-minded imperialist circles headed by the United States. At the same time, they serve as an important impetus and stimulus for developing the struggle for peace by the broadest circles of the international public. In this sense the experience of the Soviet Union's unilateral moratorium on nuclear explosions which lasted 8 months has not passed without trace. People in the most diverse countries evaluated this real action in favor of the cause of peace in terms of its value and understood that if one of the leading nuclear powers had decided to take such a bold step, the planet can really be rid of nuclear tests and, ultimately, of nuclear weapons themselves. The Soviet Union will continue to strive to stop all nuclear explosions, the CPSU Central Committee general secretary's reply to a new message from the leaders of six countries states.

The struggle to put an end to nuclear explosions continues, including in the United States. On the threshold of 1 May, G. Lawrence, member of the leadership of the well-known American public organization "Physicians for Social Responsibility," demanded in the press that the U.S. Administration give a positive response to the USSR's proposal to end nuclear tests. Many specialists on military problems, he noted, are convinced that if a mutual moratorium on all nuclear explosions were to be introduced, the world would become a safer place. What is more, this would free vast means for solving the urgent social and economic problems daily encountered by Americans. "Dangerous and without prospects" is how he terms the Washington administration's policy of whipping up the arms race, as a result of which general security invariably suffers. Continuing nuclear tests under these conditions means continuing the bankrupt policy of the arms race, G. Lawrence stated.

Also worthy of note is the statement by bishops from the United Methodist Church, which is influential in the United States, who, a CBS television correspondent reported, have reached the conclusion that "just praying for peace is now not enough." They recently condemned any use of nuclear weapons, including as a "means of deterrence." It is well known that earlier the American National Conference of Catholic Bishops also approved a pastoral message containing an appeal to stop the arms race and put an end to the testing and production of nuclear weapons. The message from Methodist Church bishops takes an even more decisive tone. In the United States, THE WASHINGTON POST writes, this is the "strongest statement made by any religious association on the question of nuclear war, and consequently it has attracted a great deal of attention."

The new Soviet initiatives are finding a response in political circles and among statesmen in the West. Recently, in an interview with the chief editor of the Japanese newspaper YOMIURI SHIMBUN, answering a question about the Soviet-American Geneva talks, F. Mitterrand laid quite definite stress on the Soviet proposals, obviously not by chance: "I feel great interest in the latest initiatives of the United States and the USSR, and primarily in the proposal of M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, relating to nuclear disarmament."

The positive reaction from official representatives of a number of West European countries, including U.S. allies in the North Atlantic bloc, to the new Soviet proposal on reducing conventional armed forces and arms in Europe, which was put forth in April, also serves as an indicative example in this respect.

Overcoming the obstacles erected by the U.S. Administration, the consistent and purposeful peace-loving policy of the Soviet Union paves the way to establishing lasting peace and general security.

/7358

CSO: 5200/1365

RELATED ISSUES

BRIEFS

TASS CITES PRC FOREIGN MINISTER--Helsinki May 13 TASS - TASS correspondent Vladimir Dodonov reports: China opposes the arms race and its spread into outer space, stands for a total ban on and elimination of nuclear weapons, and also for carrying out a reduction in conventional armaments and troops, said Wu Xueqian, foreign minister of the People's Republic of China, now staying here on an official visit at the invitation of Finnish Foreign Minister Paavo Vayrynen. Wu Xueqian stressed that China came out for resolving disputable issues by negotiations in the interests of scaling down international tensions. [Text] [Moscow TASS in English 1620 GMT 13 May 86 LD] /7358

CSO: 5200/1365

END

END OF

FICHE

DATE FILMED

JUNE 19/1986